

THE
EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. IX.

JULY, 1851.

ARTICLE I.

BIBLE INFLUENCE INDISPENSABLE TO SOCIETY AND THE
INSTITUTIONS OF LIFE.

By Rev. L. Eichelberger, A. M., Winchester, Va.

MAN, conscious of a higher dignity, is ever seeking to attain it. Dissatisfied with the present he grasps the future, and presses on in its attainment. Success, if success he has, animates only to renewed exertion; and increased efforts, each still greater than the former, characterize human pursuit. Still, in the expressive words of the poet, "*Curta nescio quid semper abest rei*," something, I know not what, is always wanting to success.

Such is man as developed in life, and such being human nature, his character must remain essentially the same. Happy is he, therefore, in the language of some writer: "*Cui Deus obtulit parca manu, quod satis est.*" Human nature, however, is not satisfied, and never will be, except only as controlled by a nobler and diviner principle. Like the troubled water it is restless, and presses onward in its course, sometimes realizing its objects or fancying it has done so, but in the end too often reaping bitter disappointment. The object recedes in proportion to the eagerness of the pursuit, till finally it vanishes altogether, or leads the incautious pursuer into a labyrinth so dark and difficult that escape is impracticable. Only imagined good, if not fatal error, is the consequence.

VOL. III. No. 9.

1

As is man, so are communities and societies at large. Compounded of individuals, it must partake of the characteristics inherent in the elements composing it. It is itself but the aggregation of united constituents acting in the mass. What attaches therefore to man as a constituent, must attach to society itself. The one is but the type and representative of the other, and what is predicated of the former must be true of the latter; consequently, if analyzed, no other result can be produced. Society, then, itself is as restless as the elements that compose it, and wanting fixedness and stability, it is tossed to and fro, vibrating as contingent breezes may direct it. The wind that is most boisterous generally controls its course and decides its destiny.

The view of human nature we have given, whether of man in his isolated condition or associated in society, is not too highly colored. What is here predicated of him, is but the history of his race however partially exhibited, and is but too sadly confirmed by experience. It is seen in every department of life, and in reference to all its objects. You need but turn to the record of past ages, and you find it abundantly confirmed. Greece and Rome, with the nations that preceded them, are but so many illustrations of its truth, and should stand as monuments for the instruction of future ages, could their lessons be discerned. Then in letters, in science, in the arts, in government and religion, the human mind had pressed on its conquests, till like Alexander and his victories, there seemed no more worlds to subdue. Its advance in letters and science, at the period referred to, was but the effort of a boundless ambition to get knowledge, and to be wise above what is written. Even the more ancient cycles of time had their magi, learned in the knowledge of the East, long before Greece itself emerged from darkness, or the first dim rays of civilization dawned upon her horizon. History tells us that Africa herself, in that distant age, was not unlearned, and that some of the most abstruse of the sciences were there cradled and reared to full maturity. But Grecian soil seemed most congenial to the growth of literature. Here, fanned by its sunny breezes, and watered by refreshing streams from consecrated hills and groves, it struck deep its roots, and spread out its branches till it overshadowed the land. In poetry Homer, the first and last in his line, by inspiration of the muses, tuned the lyre to strains that have remained the admiration of all succeeding ages. Orpheus, too, gave inspiration to nature bending in listless attention to song, whilst Amphion, by its magic power, is said to have reared the walls of Thebes, subsequently not

less illustrious for the patriotic virtues of Epaminondas, than for her poet Pindar. But not less renowned were her orators than her poets, and the fame of her Demosthenes and Pericles can never perish. In philosophy, metaphysical and moral, she had her Lyceum and Academy, and the systems of Aristotle and Plato have divided mankind to the present day, forming the basis of all subsequent investigation and governing in its results, the one the sensual, and the other the ideal, as the source of all human knowledge; and so complete in theory that it remains to be determined, whether modern schools have done more than carried out the principles of the systems referred to.

In government also, her progress was the same. From savage life and simplest forms of association, we see republics reared by Grecian states, the model and admiration of all succeeding ages. If governments, as the result of human skill and the embodiment of the best principles of political science, would abide, surely the republics of Athens and Lacedemon should have remained; the one founded on the wisdom, and the other upon the rigid virtues, of their respective legislators. But the wisdom of a Solon and the integrity of a Lycurgus, with the keen researches of Aristotle superadded, could not make them endure.

In religion it was the same, and exhibits the same restless and onward movement of the human mind, but here more dark and obscure from the moral darkness that enshrouded it. Still its efforts were remarkable, and were bounded only by the veil of impenetrable mystery that fettered it; for not retaining the knowledge of the true God as revealed by himself, idolatry and superstition would be substituted in its place. Here the mind could not exert an energy it did not possess, and powers it had lost. The crude forms of Paganism were therefore the best results it could produce, and however improved its theories, it was but Paganism still. The most refined mythology could go no further, and conscious of the fruitless task it was forced to confess its ignorance. Whilst Socrates assumed the being of a God, he could know nothing with certainty of the immortality to which he aspired.

The history of Greece, in the particulars and aspects referred to, is but repeated in the progress of the Roman empire, and the development of human nature, as again exhibited in its experience, need not be repeated. Still the lesson it teaches must not be forgotten. It must not be forgotten, that Rome stood for centuries the proud mistress of the world and controlled a boundless empire. She had, too, her poets and her

orators, her schools and her philosophy, her statesmen and her victorious generals, but Rome fell and her mighty empire with her.

As was the progress of the human mind, and its development in ancient days, so is it now. Our own age bears testimony to the same restless ambition and onward effort in all the departments of life, and makes its impress upon all the institutions of society. Tossed to and fro, like a ship at sea, we are carried along by countless breezes that fill the sail, and, made presumptuous by the boldness of past experiments, we press on in the march of enterprise and improvement without regard to consequences, provided only our progress be not impeded. And who will not say, that the advance we have made is not astounding, both in boldness and experiment and in its actual results, ours casting into the shade and sinking into insignificance the ages that have preceded it? So great and so rapid are the developments of the day we live in, that a new era seems to have dawned upon the world, and the human intellect, as if aroused from the slumber of ages, and strengthened by past inaction, starts anew in its onward course of improvement. In letters and the various departments of literature and science, we seem to have reached the utmost heights to which the wildest ambition could aspire. Despising the ancients, even as jejune and insipid, and their best productions no longer as suitable models for imitation, the age has formed a literature for itself, and now literally "to the making of books there is no end." In the arts and sciences new theories and new systems have followed on in such rapid succession as to bewilder, by their novelty, boldness and pretensions. In the philosophy of life and mechanics, invention is added to invention, and improvement to improvement, till piled like Ossa upon Pelion, the utmost stretch of human discovery seems to have been gained. To the age we live in it was reserved to understand and control the elements of nature, and, by governing them aright, subdue nature herself. Land and sea are now traversed successfully by the force of an element adequate to the utmost wants of life, and limited only by inadequate strength in the material supplied by nature to confine it. Time and space and distance are annihilated altogether, and kingdoms and continents, disjoined by nature, are again successfully united by the magic of art. Whether human admiration will be bounded by the wonders of electro-magnetism as now developed, or whether triumphs remain for science to achieve, time only can reveal.

In government, and morals and religion, we have made the same onward progress. Investigating minutely the principles of the former, and trying them by the fixed maxims of a sound political economy, we have reared the foundations of a government that we judged must be commensurate with time itself. Based upon what was deemed the broadest principles of political union, and surrounded by the best safeguards the wisest heads and purest hearts could give it, we rejoiced over it as perpetual. In morals and religion we have developed all the resources of human contrivance, refining and improving even upon revelation itself, till surely the very acme of ethics and theology is attained. We have now systems, and rules, and dogmas and doctrines, good and bad, rational and absurd, *multiplied ad infinitum*, till surely the wildest fanatic can be accommodated, whilst of *sects and tribes and parties and isms* the proper name is *legion*, for you cannot number them.

Such as we have now exhibited is the progress of the age we live in, and its supposed advance upon the past. Its triumphs, compared with ages gone by, may be such indeed as to give complacency to the mind studious of contrivance, and flatter human pride to its utmost desire. In some departments of life the progress may be real, and certainly is. Science, guided by the utilitarian spirit of the age, has doubtless added to the advantages and benefits of life. But how far society as a whole, especially in its moral and religious aspects, is advanced, remains to be seen. Every discovery may not prove a blessing in its results, and developments for evil as well as good must be expected, as the one usually will be found an attendant upon the other. But assuming the progress made to be real and fraught with the benefits expected — assuming that in literature, science and the arts of life, we have advanced as is supposed, and that in government and religion we have reached the utmost perfection, which we should hesitate to admit, are the results such as to make them abiding? Will they stand the test of experiment, and be adequate to control the adverse influences of life? Will they be sufficient to meet the wants of society, and the mutations, in its social, civil and moral relations, to which it must necessarily be exposed? Are these results of advanced civilization and refinement, these deductions of improved science and experiment, fixed upon a basis broad and firm enough to resist the angry and turbid current of opposing elements beating against them. And if not; if they are without adequate strength in themselves to endure, if they are unable to resist the overwhelming torrent of antagonistic principles that time and its revolutions

must array against them, what additional element is requisite to give them durability? It is to the candid and impartial consideration of the questions here propounded, we propose to invite attention in the following pages.

I. The first question that presents itself is, whether society and its institutions, as now constituted and developed, *have in them the requisite principles of durability*. In considering the inquiry here presented, we assume in behalf of the institutions of society the utmost progress they are said to have made, and give to them the benefit of all the advantages directly or indirectly resulting from their utmost improvement. We allow them the highest degree of perfection claimed as resulting from the deductions and discoveries of past and present ages. We ascribe to them all that the utmost refinement and civilization can demand, and thus fortified and supported, we press the inquiry referred to, *will they abide*? Have they the requisite elements of durability to preserve them? We believe they have not, and that a free and candid examination of the question will establish this result, however painful and mortifying its admission may be.

1. We see nothing in the progress of letters, and the influences of a refined taste and literature to secure such result. Whether, in this department, we have made any great advance upon the ancients is a question that might admit of discussion. Whether in elegance and purity of style and force of language, if not in other important requisites, they are not still our superiors, is undetermined. But allowing to modern literature all that it can claim, we question greatly if it has not lost in precision and power of expression, all that it has gained in taste and a refined diction. Have the sublime verses of Homer, the sweet songs of Anacreon and Pindar, the *Æneid* of Virgil and the odes of Horace been really surpassed in some of the elements of perfection as writers they possessed, and if so, by whom? Have not Demosthenes and Cicero, in some perfections of the orator and forensic eloquence, remained unrivalled? Have Herodotus and Xenophon and Livy and others been greatly surpassed in the department of history and the essential requisites of the historian, and have the rules of a sound and correct criticism been greatly improved upon, in their elements, since the days of Longinus and of Cicero? But admitting our progress in literature and its varied departments, and also its more general diffusion, what is there in it to give durability to the institutions of society that Grecian and Roman literature did not possess? Assuming, too, in our favor the invention of the art of printing, the multiplication of

books, and the greater diffusion of learning as its consequence, still such is the wide spread mischief of an impure and vicious literature, tainting with its pollution the fountain of life, that we know not which most preponderates from the discovery referred to, the good or the evil. But allowing the former to prevail, still what is there in the productions of the age, and in the mass of its refined and varied literature, to preserve society and save its institutions from decay, that the more solid instructions of the ancients did not possess. We fear there is nothing and that time will so reveal it.

2. But in the theories of an improved philosophy, may we not find the security we are in search of. If by an improved philosophy we mean an absolute knowledge of mind and matter, and of the laws by which they are impelled and act upon each other, we fear that modern skill has but little to boast of or arrogate to itself. Apart from revelation and its sublime teachings in this department of knowledge, the absolute certainty is, that but little advance has been made upon the ancients, and wherein progress has been made, its tendency too often has been in support of principles evidently vicious, immoral and disorganizing in their influence. From their conservative power we think society has but little to hope, and if not held together by other and stronger cords than those formed by the modern theories of an infidel philosophy, like a wrecked vessel upon the shoals of a tempestuous sea, without revelation as a pilot to direct its course, it must soon go to pieces.

We have heretofore said, that the systems of Aristotle and Plato have divided between themselves the speculations (for they merit no better name) of philosophy to the present time. "Whoever," in the language of a late writer, "believes that all our ideas are derived from external sources through the senses, and all real knowledge from experiment; that God has given man the peculiar faculty of reason, as the only safe guide through the perilous paths of life; and that to do the right thing in the right place, *To Et xai KAAΩΣ*, is the highest human wisdom,—he is a follower of Aristotle. Whoever, on the other hand, yields himself to a belief in innate ideas; whoever confides in the exalting faith that there is 'a Divinity that stirs within us,' and that despite 'this muddy vesture of decay that hems us in,' the Author of our being holds direct communion with our souls, regulating our impulses, guiding our instincts, and infusing into us that 'longing after immortality,' which sustains the struggling spirit through the great *Μαχη* *Αθαρτος* of the universe,—he is a disciple of Plato the divine."

The fact that both systems have remained to the present day the subject of dispute and controversy, proves that neither is correct, and that the one cannot claim absolute truth to itself independent of the other. "The truly wise, the genuine Christian," in the language of the same writer, "will perhaps endeavor in his practice to unite the virtues of both systems, and, in conformity with the Apostolic injunction, perfect his faith by his works, and thus consummate the civilization of mankind." Apart from this, and as the results of philosophy alone, the nature and objects of which have so sadly been perverted, society and its constitutions, as we have said, have at best but little to hope for. Abused as it has been, and ever may be, its tendency is too evidently adverse to the teachings of revelation, and its conclusions, under the guidance of an infidel age, too insecure and uncertain to base upon it the hopes of man. Tortured as it will be by corrupt minds, and perverted to the ends of vice and irreligion, especially in an irreligious age, the virtuous and good have nothing to hope from it. Deism, Fourierism, Socialism, and other *isms* as expedients in opposition to revelation, may be strengthened by it, but whether, if successful, they will answer the ends of society and be adequate to preserve its institutions, time will reveal. In these remarks we have of course considered the teachings of philosophy apart from and independent of revelation, and have reasoned accordingly.

3. But may not *science and the arts of life*, as now improved and perfected, prove a sufficient basis for society and its interests to rest upon? We admit the unprecedented progress of physical science, and its successful application to the arts of life. Its achievements have been such as to dazzle and bewilder, and the mind, in its amazement, is at a loss which to admire most, the intricacy of contrivance and magnitude of machinery and of power, or the results that are produced and their influence upon the operations and business of life. Passing by other improvements, the successful application of steam power, as a motive agent, to almost all the departments of mechanics, in itself is destined to effect a total revolution in the various branches of industrial pursuit, requiring heretofore the joint labor of man and beast to perform them. It has in fact already done so. The products of the soil and of commerce, however gross and cumbrous, are now transported without either, and not only the remote portions of the same country, but distant ports and continents are joined together by its magic force. Time and labor are now measurably dispensed with, and that which once was the work of

ages, is now as it were but the business of a day. Magnetic induction, too, has been brought in to perfect what the motive force of steam had not effected, and under the control of science is made subservient to the communication of thought with a velocity equalled only by the rapidity of thought itself. It now only remains for man to think, and time will show whether the next onward movement, in this march of improvement, will not be some *machine* for this, so as to relieve both mind and body from the drudgery of labor. These, however, cannot give durability to the institutions of society, nor do they claim to do so.

4. Another power also has been brought into requisition, too important to be overlooked, we mean the *power of associated intellect and wealth*. What was too difficult for individual enterprise, or too slow in its accomplishment for the electric speed of the age we live in, is now readily effected by this almost boundless power of combination. If knowledge and wealth are both power, how irresistible, then, their united energy! By its potent touch barren hills are made fertile plains, mountains are cut down and levelled with the sea, and mount Athos no longer stands solitary and alone on the page of classic history, to excite the admiration of the world. The sea itself is now made to recede, and where "its proud waves lashed the shore," commerce claims its soil as her own.— Towns and cities spring up as by enchantment, their stately palaces are reared in a day, and the Pantheon and Parthenon, the perfection of ancient art and the pride of both Greece and Rome, are no longer adequate models for the imitation of modern grandeur.

These, all these are the results of modern science, and of our progress in its application to the arts of life. Will the institutions of society and society itself find in them the conservative power they require? Will they save them from final decay, and will civilization itself ultimately be the gainer by them? We trow not. We fear they have not the power of durability, and that considered in themselves, apart from other influences, they may not only perish, but society and its interests, now so proudly eminent, may perish with them. Thebes once had a hundred gates and her golden towers. Babylon was once the proud mistress of the East, defended by massy walls and adorned with palaces and gardens floating in the air. Athens and other cities of Greece were renowned for all that was elegant in literature and the arts, and Rome stood the queen of empires and mistress of the world; but the tooth of

time has crushed them all. They wanted something more than the perfection of art and marble to make them abide. Becoming "vain in their imaginations, their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools; and even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient." Their downfall, consequently, was inevitable, and Paul, speaking by inspiration of God, assigns the reason for it.

5. But if neither letters, science nor the arts of life, however developed and perfected, can give security to the interests of society, may not *government and the laws under it be so modelled and constructed as to supply the defect*. In the structure of government, and a skilful analysis of the social compact, the human mind has not lagged behind in its progress to perfection. Here, as in other things, the utmost possible advance has been made. Aided by the experience of the old world, which had tested the power and strength of government in all its forms, having too the advantage of a thorough knowledge of their benefits and defects, their sources of strength and grounds of weakness, in what they had legislated too much, and in what not enough — analysing also the principles of the science, so as to incorporate into it only that which was essential to stability, and not incompatible with the rights of the governed, we have sought to rear the fabric of government so that nothing should be wanting to its complete structure, that we might present it to the world as a model for the imitation of all succeeding ages in the science of civil economy. We have framed the model, and have now tested its operation for more than half a century. Perhaps it is a just advance upon all former efforts, and as perfect as human skill and contrivance could make it. At least it is so regarded and no doubt justly. It was the work of an age purified by the sacrifice of the blood and treasure of the country, spent in defence of human rights and in resistance to oppression. It was put together by the wisest heads and best hearts that age had produced. It was subjected to the rigid scrutiny of men who sought to secure by it not their own, but their country's good. They have left it as the best legacy they had to bequeath to posterity, and the experience of half a century proves that they were not mistaken in their estimate of its worth. It is probably then the best that human skill could devise, or human contrivance frame. But will it abide? Will it be strong to endure? Will it be able to stand the test of time

and the fearful experiment that time will require? Are its elements such as to enable it to resist the terrible shock of antagonistic interests from within, as well as resistance from without? We trust it may. For it we would all most fervently pray, and to preserve it in its purity would sacrifice our all. But in what is our hope? Is it in the perfection of government in itself considered? Is it in the skill of political science, or the exactness with which its principles have been understood and combined? In these respects we may not be much in advance of the ancients. Athens and Lacedæmon imagined the same. They had incorporated the same elements in their systems, and employed the same skill in their construction. Lacedæmon especially sought to give durability to its system by superadding the stern virtue of its citizens. But did it abide? Did either Athens or Sparta, with all the polish of the one and rigid virtue of the other, remain? They did not and could not; not because of the imperfection of government, but because of the imperfection of virtue. Theirs was not the virtue of a pure religion. It was but submission to authority, the submission of the weaker to the stronger power. *It was rigid virtue from necessity.* They required a purer motive to obedience and the principles of a purer morality. Their theology imparted no true knowledge of God, the practice of which would be pleasing in his sight, but substituted for it the licentiousness, and superstitions of a degrading mythology. Their civil economy was therefore doomed to pass away, being inadequate in itself without the aid of a pure religion, and ours without a similar support must ultimately do the same. We must have the religion of the Bible to perpetuate it, and the virtues it enjoins to sustain it. We must have its divine teachings and solemn sanctions as adequate motives to obedience. Without these our experiment will be in vain and fruitless, however strong the cords of government otherwise cemented.

6. *Nor will morality alone in itself be sufficient.* It must be the *morality of the Bible.* It must be a morality springing from just views of God, and the obligations due to him. The divine law itself must be our standard of right and wrong, and not the crude and loose teachings of men. Systems of moral ethics are easily framed and digested, and as easily accommodated to the character of the times they are intended to subserve. They may be good or bad, virtuous or licentious, according to the character of the source from which they spring. "Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree

bringeth forth good fruit ; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them." The morality of Hume, of Gibbon or Voltaire, would be very different from the morality of the Bible, and their ethics would be accordingly. Their systems might be plausible and suited to the moral sense of infidelity, but not that of a religion "pure and undefiled before God and man." Nor is it the morality of antiquity that we need. The teachings of Zeno, of Socrates, of Cicero or of Seneca, might justly be commended for the age in which they lived, and the dim light of nature on which they were based, but the christian world has given to it a better revelation, even "the sure word of prophecy," and its principles of morality are to be governed by it. We need, therefore, the moral teachings of the Bible, and not the ethics of men, to guide our course, and to govern equally in the duties we owe both to God and man.

But if neither literature, science and the arts of life, nor yet the best systems of political economy or morality will give to society adequate security, what is there that can supply it? Is there such conservative principle for the institutions of time, and whence the source from which it can be derived? This brings us to the next general step in our inquiries, in answer to which we reply :

II. That there must be such conservative power for society, and that its institutions cannot abide without it. God doubtless designed man in his social condition, as a constituent of society, to be the subject of his government as fully and completely as in his individual character. The personal relations man sustains to him as such are neither forfeited nor destroyed. They remain in full force, and with all their binding obligation, as fully as before the social compact was formed. This cannot be doubted for a moment, and if it were, this fact itself would be adequate proof of idiocracy in the subject of it, and of his fitness for an association with lunacy rather than with the society of rational beings. If the force of these anterior obligations remain then binding as fully as before, and man's new relation as a member of society cannot destroy them, and as society itself, as heretofore shown, is but the aggregation of individuals in the social compact for their common good, it follows, necessarily, that the mass itself must be bound as a whole. And this is just the position of society, and of communities in their social and moral relations. In passing from their individual to their social condition, as members of society and subjects of government, they have surrendered nothing in regard to God and his requirements, whatever they may have

given up in regard to each other. Communities and governments, therefore, are as much subject, morally, to divine law, as were the individuals composing them. They must be so from necessity and the nature of the case. Any other supposition would be an *argumentum ad absurdum*. Besides, the Creator intended man for his social and civil relations, and would not be likely to annul the divine relations under which those relations alone could be adequately guarded and sustained. This is self-evident and needs no argument to illustrate or defend it.

Such, then, being man's position as a member of the social compact and of society itself, resulting as a consequence from man's social being; and communities and governments themselves being formed in obedience to the divine will, it follows that they are not left without the possibility of some adequate power to preserve them. This doubtless was given from the beginning, and fully and clearly revealed to man; but "loving darkness more than light," he chose to close his eyes against the truth, and resist its power, because his deeds were evil. In Gen. 6: 5. God says of man: "That every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." This was his character, as Jehovah himself testifies, almost from the beginning, at which time already it is added: "That the wickedness of man was great in the earth." This fearful account of human depravity, and the rapid increase of wickedness in the earth, even at this early period, is given by God himself, and plainly intimates that the conservative restrictions and sanctions ordained by him were soon obliterated from the human mind. The Apostle says of them: "That when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools; and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like unto corruptible man, and to birds, and four footed beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness." Rom. 1: 18-32. This is the Apostle's argument, and shows that the Gentile nations rejecting God, and consequently the sanctions He ordained, were given up by him to reap the fruit of their own doing. These divine sanctions were such, we believe, as fully to meet all the wants of man, social, civil and religious, and secure human happiness. These being lost sight of, we must go back to God again, and seek in him and in his appointments the security we need. It can be derived from no other source, and society and its institutions can find safety on no other

basis than that of conformity to his will. The wisdom and perfection of human organism, however great in itself and of itself, cannot give it. Infinite wisdom alone is adequate to supply it. But this God has manifested only in his word. Hence we add :

Finally, That the Bible alone gives this adequate security, and that human organism, however complete, can possess it on no other basis. This *a fortiori* must necessarily be inferred. It follows, also, from the views already presented, the arguments they have embodied, and the conclusions they involve. The facts exhibited in regard to the past history of man, and the institutions of society in all ages of the world, abundantly establish it. They are the melancholy records of time; the sad monuments of imperfection marked upon the wisest efforts of man that never can be effaced. They are God's own witnesses of the folly of man guided by himself. These facts, then, we desire the reader to retain, whilst we proceed to illustrate further the conclusion before us. That the Bible, then, is the only basis adequate to give security to the institutions of society, and human organism in general, we infer :

1st. From the fact that *God did not sanction its existence independent of himself.* This follows from the sovereignty of God. As King of kings and Lord of lords, above all men and over all, his own will would ordain the law under which his creatures should exist, and the authority by which they should be bound. That law would be in accordance with the nature of his own being, and would be based upon it. The nature of the case would require subjection to it on the part of man. In fact he could not escape from it. God would necessarily institute such requirements as infinite wisdom would dictate as essential, and his position as a sovereign would require their enforcement. This would follow from the relation that had been instituted. Hence we read, that when God created man, he allowed him the use of all the trees of the garden in which he had been placed, except "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," and in regard to it added the penalty : "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Gen. 2: 17. But previously we read, that "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which he had made." This sanctification of the day implied in itself the obligation to its observance, and God's requirement as such. Again, after the transgression, God says to Adam : "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded

thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life. Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field: In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." Here we learn, even in the case of Adam, that his Creator not only had enjoined restrictions, but had added suitable sanctions to enforce them, and that it was the violation of these restrictions that caused his punishment. With the nature and justice of these restrictions and the punishment of the violation, we have nothing to do. We only refer to the facts recorded, to show that even in the case of Adam, and the favored circumstances of his position, God regarded him as under obligations to obedience and punished his disobedience. In other words, that as sovereign he did not leave Adam independent of divine authority, but bound him to its observance. Much less then, subsequently, when Adam had fallen and his position in regard to God was changed from a state of innocence and holiness to that of transgression, would God leave him or his posterity to act independent of his control.

Subsequently, when Cain and Abel had offered gifts unto the Lord, and Cain was angry because the offering of his brother had been accepted and his not, the Lord said unto Cain: "Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?" Here we see that the posterity of Adam were likewise under obligations to obedience, and that the divine favor in their behalf was made to depend upon their conformity to his will. Again, God says to Cain: "If thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door," which imports the same. When God determined to destroy the world by the flood, we read in regard to it, that it was corrupt and filled with violence. "And God looked upon the earth, and behold it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them: and behold I will destroy them with the earth." Here we have given the cause of man's destruction, implying both divine authority and obligation to obedience. The same condition is observed in the terms of the covenant made with Abraham: "*Walk before me and be thou perfect.*" The same condition is again observed in the renewal of the covenant with Abraham's posterity. To Isaac at Gerar the Lord said: "I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these coun-

tries; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed: *because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes and my laws.*"

Here we are more specifically informed that Abraham's obedience was involved in the covenant God had made with him, and that on account of his obedience, to which God testifies himself, not only his posterity, but all the nations of the earth should be blessed. The condition was still the same, as again and again verified by God to Moses, through whom he more fully revealed the law itself, and the extent of its requirements. At Sinai he said to him: "Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel, *if ye will obey my voice and keep my covenant*, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me," &c. Exod. 19: 3-5. Paul, in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, already referred to, proves that the Gentile nations were under a like obligation to acknowledge God and walk in his ways; that "the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness, and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness;" and that "*they are without excuse*," because "the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are already seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even his eternal power and Godhead.*" This acknowledgment of God, therefore, and conformity to his will, under every possible form of human existence, God's sovereignty requires and cannot by man with impunity be rejected. But,

2. The Bible is the only secure basis of society and its interests, because it alone imparts to man *just views of his relations to his fellow-man and the duties they impose*. These relations have been created by God himself, and are independent of man's influence or control over them. They are such as infinite wisdom saw fit to institute, and created by God himself, like all his orderings, they must be right in themselves, and essential to the well being and happiness of man. They are doubtless so, whether thus recognized by man or not, and instituted by God, he exacts obedience to them without regard to man's appreciation of their importance. They may tend, as they doubtless do, to promote the best interests of man for time and eternity; nay, they may be essential to his very being, under the varied circumstances of his existence, and society in its diversified interests may depend upon their rigid observance, yet man in his rejection of God and general opposition to his will, may choose to disregard them all together. Men have done so in all past ages of the world, and except so far as controlled by the grace of God, will do so unto the end.

But as the Apostle says in regard to circumcision among the Jews: "What if some did not believe? shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect?" Rom. 3: 6. So neither can the unbelief and wicked opposition of men, affect in the least the importance of the relations social, civil and moral, God has ordained, or impair their binding character. God has instituted them for purposes best known and understood by himself, and the fact that He has ordained them is the best evidence of their wisdom, and that he means to insist upon their binding obligation. Let us advert for a moment to some of these relations, and the divine view of their importance, however slightly regarded by man himself. And first:

a) The marriage relation, which is of God's own ordering, forcibly illustrates the point in question. That the marriage relation is of divine origin is not questioned, because it is given us by express appointment of God himself. Gen. 2: 18-25. Christ in the Gospel adverts to and confirms the same, and adds: "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." Matth. 19: 4-6. According to the beautiful and expressive language of the church, recommended to her ministers to be used by them in the solemnization of marriage: "It is the union of one man with one woman for their joint happiness, and for the pious education of children where God gives them, and by the original appointment of the Almighty, confirmed by our Saviour, is to be dissolved only by death." God, however, not only instituted marriage, and annexed to it its binding obligations, but, by express command, determined the degrees of consanguinity by which it was to be regulated, and within which marriage was not proper, the law of Moses forbidding it between all more nearly related than cousins. Lev. 18 and 20. Sometimes more special directions and prohibitions in regard to it, were given by God to his people, and their obedience enforced by suitable sanctions and rewards. The Hebrews, for example, were forbidden to marry with the heathen, and especially with the Canaanites, Exod. 23: 32. and 34: 12-16. Such marriages being against the law and in violation of it, they were null and void; and hence Ezra and Nehemiah, in restoring their religion and its institutions, required the Jews to put away their Heathenish wives, as by the law their marriage was unlawful. Ezra 9 and 10.

God having thus instituted marriage and determined the degrees of consanguinity that constitute its legality, prescribed also the duties of both man and woman when thus solemnly

united, and the obligations growing out of it. These by Moses were specifically and minutely detailed, and the punishment annexed which God enjoined upon their violation. Christ recognizes the same duties and obligations in his answer to the Pharisees, Mark 10: 2-12. Tempting him they asked: "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? He answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you? They said Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement and put her away. Jesus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept: but from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife. And they twain shall be one flesh," &c. Paul, Eph. 5: 22-23, refers to the same, and specially illustrates the great principle of love that should govern the marriage relation, commanding that husbands love their wives, "even as Christ loved the church and gave himself for it;" and again adding, "Let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband."

Such is the institution of marriage as God ordained it, and the divine law of love that should govern and control it. As prescribed and contemplated by him, it is doubtless designed, in the highest degree, to promote human happiness and prevent the multiplied evils to man the absence of the marriage relation would entail. Yet men, as is too often unhappily the case, may choose to disregard the obligations altogether, or if they so far recognize them as to secure the sanction of marriage, it is regarded only as a formal ceremony, and submitted to out of respect to society and the custom that prescribes it, whilst its binding obligations, as God has instituted it, are wholly disregarded. And even the little respect for it as God's ordinance that remains, the refinements of modern Socialism would renounce altogether, and give unrestrained license to crime and the untold evils to society that must follow its subversion. God, however, by the institution of marriage and the obligations it imposes saw fit to control and regulate the relations of society in this respect, and the Bible will perpetuate it, and enforce its sanctions whether appreciated by men or not. But if with the Bible, and all its sacred influences superadded, the marriage compact and the duties it creates, are so slightly regarded as they are by thousands, what would be the result under the teachings of Socialism without it? Who can calculate the consequences to human happiness, or measure the extent of human wretchedness, had not God thus wisely provided to prevent it? The Bible and its sanctions

are essential therefore to the well ordering of society in the important relation referred to, and could not be dispensed with without results fatal to human happiness.

b) Again, the parental relation is among the most important in society, and fraught with the most important consequences to man as a social and moral being, both for time and eternity. Who can calculate the benefits resulting from a proper and faithful discharge of all the duties it enjoins, or fathom the depths of crime and misery resulting from their neglect? God knowing and foreseeing these results, wisely ordained that this relation should be associated with such obligations as would make it contribute to the benefit of society and the happiness of man, and not add to human misery. The Bible is full of the most solemn injunctions to parents in regard to their children, the manner in which they should be taught and governed, and the great ultimate end for which life was given them. It was made specially obligatory upon Jewish parents to instruct their children in the divine law and God's covenant with them. God said unto Abraham: "Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou and thy seed after thee, in all their generations. This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; Every man-child among you shall be circumcised; and it shall be a token of the covenant between me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man-child in your generations," &c. "and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." Gen. 17: 9-15. Hence, in the full and perfect knowledge of this covenant and the obligations it enjoined, they were carefully to instruct their children, as well as give them, when eight days old, the outward token of it in the flesh by circumcision. It was this knowledge of God's covenant with them and their obedience to its requirements, that constituted them the people of God and entitled them to his favor. "For," says the Apostle, "he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit," &c. Rom. 2: 28-29. The perpetuation of this covenant from generation to generation, the outward sign of which was circumcision, depended entirely upon parental faithfulness, and hence the care with which God enjoined it. Of many professing Christian parents, wholly neglecting the moral and religious instruction of their children, and bringing them up in utter ignorance of God's covenant with them, and in ignorance even of the outward sign of it, we might pause to enquire how their neg-

lect in this respect corresponds with the duties they owe their children as parents, enjoined upon them by the word and ordinances of God. There is resting here a responsibility of the most fearful nature, and woe to parents, in this our day of light and knowledge, whose children in judgment shall rise up and condemn them, appearing on that awful occasion as swift witnesses against them.

Paul refers to the same subject, and the solemn responsibility of parents when he says: "Ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," Ephes. 6: 4. Yet notwithstanding the orderings of God here referred to, and the awful consequences that must ensue both to the parent and the child, how many parents are not criminally neglectful as to duty in this particular, whilst multitudes are wholly obdurate as to God and conscience, and seemingly wreckless as to consequences. The beauties of modern Socialism may here be seen which allows to parents the abandonment of their offspring altogether. If these things, then, are true, with the Bible and all its penalties superadded, well may we ask, what would they not be without it? How essential, then, is not the Bible and its sanctions, to the interests of society in this respect, and how indispensable to human happiness!

c) Other relations of society might be referred to in confirmation of the same great truth, but our limits admonish us to forbear. There are some, however, too important to be entirely unnoticed, and to which we must briefly refer: among these we notice the *relation of our common brotherhood and of social life*. In the circles of social life and its business arrangements, we are all from necessity associated together, and are made dependant upon each other. Rich and poor, high and low, bond and free; the man of letters and the grossly ignorant, they that govern and the governed, all in this respect are joined together by a common lot, a common necessity, and a common interest. The one here is dependant upon the other, a part upon the whole, and the whole upon its integrant parts. This is strikingly illustrated by the fable of the "body and the limbs," familiar to the classic reader. This relation includes in it also the business interests of life, and all the countless little offices of duty, propriety and affection, growing out of it. How important in regard to these, that all should be governed by at least the common law of justice and of equity, if by no higher principle! But even this, so essential to the interests of society, would be wanting without the Bible. It is God's word that supplies it, and not only supplies but enforces it.

Apart from all the divine precepts to this end elsewhere given, Christ has furnished a summary of the whole in his sermon on the mount, and especially in his commandment: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them;" adding by way of confirmation, "for this is the law and the prophets." How different this from the maxims and teachings of the world! Its morality is absorbed by the principle of self-love alone, and knows no law, either of duty or of charity, save such only as interest may prescribe. Self, not charity, is the motive power of all its impulses and governs all its actions. It knows no kindness, no gentleness, no mercy. It seeks only its own, and literally exacts "its pound of flesh." Its law of love is covetousness, which is idolatry. It has no pity, no compassion for suffering humanity, and drops no tear over the misfortunes of life its charities might have relieved. Such is man without the Bible and uninfluenced by its teachings. What, then, would be society unblessed by its influence, and governed alone by the principles we have referred to? Who can estimate its evils or calculate the sum of human wretchedness that must ensue? Infinite wisdom alone could tell it, and foreseeing it, divine goodness interposed to prevent it. God has spoken in his word, yea, and as the Psalmist says, "Thou has magnified thy word above all thy name." It will abide forever, and knowing that every jot and tittle of it shall be fulfilled, the wicked stand in awe of its authority, and tremble at its thunderings. Bad as the world may be, society finds in it a conservative power to bless and save. It feels that its teachings are divine, that its requirements are right, that its threatened judgments are just, and under the shadow of its wings it rests securely. The Bible, then, is not only essential to its well being, but is in this respect, to poor suffering humanity, heaven's best gift. How blind the ignorance and how wicked the philosophy that would reject it!

d) Again, the social compact is involved in the relation man sustains to his fellow-man and grows out of it. This implies the science of government and is based upon it. It assumes man's capability to constitute such government, and to discharge the duties it imposes. On this subject, viz. man's capability for self-government, much has been learnedly said and written, especially in support of it. The arguments employed, however, are too often based upon assumption alone, and attribute too much to the force of reason and mere human philosophy. They assume that enlightened reason, assisted alone by experience and a more perfect knowledge of government, is adequate to the task, and our own government is re-

ferred to as demonstration of its truth. Of the wisdom and patriotism of its venerable framers we have no doubt, and we share in the regard their memories deserve. They fondly hoped that they had achieved the object of their wishes, and in the structure they reared imagined they had found a basis for it, deep and broad enough to endure forever — "*monumentum perennius ære.*" But what says experience, even the experience of less than a single century? Does this sustain the fond hope indulged in regard to it? And as we have already asked, will it endure? Will it withstand the corroding tooth of time? Is it strong enough, and are its several parts sufficiently compacted and joined together to resist the current of opposing forces that beat against it? Has it provided amply for any and every emergency that may arise to test its power of endurance? We fondly hope so; but our best hopes sometimes deceive us. We believe our venerable fathers not only did the best they could, but the best that was possible. They were actuated by the purest motives, and had the experience and history of the world to aid them. Their struggle for freedom had been the struggle of desperation, and having finally achieved it, they determined to secure to posterity the fruit of their hard earned labors. To this end the government they formed, it is just to assume, was the best that was possible, and is the best certainly ever framed by man. But still it was the work of men's hands, and as such necessarily imperfect. So must every other government be, formed by man. However much improved compared with such as have preceded it, it cannot be absolutely perfect, or provide to meet all the possible contingencies that may arise under it. How then shall these necessary and admitted imperfections be remedied? How shall their deficiencies be supplied? We answer, the only adequate remedy is in the virtue and piety of its citizens. Their purity, integrity and uprightness, must supply the defects of human legislation, and make up the deficiencies that mark all human compacts and the theories upon which they rest. But this moral purity in the citizen the Bible only can secure. Its divine and heavenly influences alone can produce it. Divine authority is essential to this result, and God speaking through his word, by virtue of such authority, alone can effect it.

The success of government, therefore, however wisely framed, depends upon the Bible and the conservative and purifying influence it exerts. Still there are those who hesitate to admit it. The statesman looks to the head and not to the heart. He builds his hopes upon the intelligence and as-

sumed virtue of the people, and argues from these alone their capacity for self-government. But how is this assumed virtue to be produced? What is to secure and perpetuate it? Philosophy cannot do it. The teachings of a loose and superficial morality cannot do it. Human theories, however refined and plausible, are inadequate to the task. The Bible, as we said, alone can do it. Destroy this, and you take from government the firmest pillar upon which it rests. Impair its influence, and in exact proportion, you weaken its moral power and diminish its chances of success. As citizens, therefore, and anxious alone for the success of the institutions of society we prize so dearly, we should deprecate that refined infidelity of modern times which, warring against the Bible, seeks to destroy its power, and having done this, would leave us, in the storms of life, to the mercy of the winds and waves, without aught but human reason to guide us in our course. The loose and licentious theories of our day, especially as now developing in Europe and elsewhere, show but too plainly what unaided reason would do, and in France especially, is giving sad evidences of her power to guide aright the destiny of man. If to reject the Bible and its teachings, denying the sanctity of its divinely appointed institutions, and among them the obligations of the marriage contract; if to upturn at once the settled order of society, denying all personal responsibility, except so far as the grossest licentiousness may choose to sanction it; if a reckless rejection of the rights of others and the denying of all morality; if these will bless society and give hope to man, then may the Bible be rejected and reason substituted in its place.

In regard to the social compact, therefore, and man's relations under it to his fellow man, as well as all the associations that grow out of it, they are dependant for their success and permanency upon the moral force given them by the Bible and its sanctions. Remove these and you destroy effectually their power of endurance. We have no faith, therefore, in the institutions of life, whether social, civil or religious, except so far as God is acknowledged in them and his word made the ultimate basis upon which they rest. We have no confidence in the capacity of man for any thing that is for the glory of God and the final good of man, except so far as God may guide and govern it. We regard the Bible as essential to success in all the institutions of life, involving man's relations to his fellow-man, and contend that no teachings of mere human philosophy can be substituted for it. Its absence, sooner or later, would prove fatal to the whole, however profound the

skill by which the fair fabric had been erected. Other relations, growing out of man's social being might be referred to, but the above we deem sufficient as they involve the rest.

3. But, apart from the relations sustained by man to his fellow-man thus far considered, the Bible is essential to the institutions of society, because it alone imparts *right views in regard to God and the relations we sustain to him*. These relations, and the duties that grow out of them, are more important than all others. They involve man's happiness both now and hereafter. His interests are affected by them in a twofold form, and in a higher degree they claim his regard. Between virtue and happiness, and vice and misery, God has fixed such inseparable connection, that human interests are bound to regard it and more or less will be governed by it. That just and right conduct tends inevitably to success in life, instinctively leads to the practice of it, and consequently to the good of society in general. Society is benefitted in proportion to the extent that this principle extends and regulates the acts and conduct of men. It is the Bible, however, that assures us of the principle as fixed by God himself, and urges to its observance. Under its influence men are led to the practice of virtue for the sake of the benefits thereby secured to themselves, and society by it is made a gainer with them. Its institutions are thus strengthened and preserved by the fixed relations of morality God has instituted, and which the teachings of his word enforce.

But there is another and a higher sense in which society derives a conservative influence from the Bible acting upon man's relations to God, and the proper knowledge of them as taught in his word. In it man is made responsible directly to God himself for his doings in life, whether affecting others or confined to himself. And that he may not plead ignorance of this responsibility to justify its violation, God has been careful to make known his commandments, involving to the fullest extent man's duty to himself as his Maker, and to his fellow-man. These commands, though specific from their nature, are yet so broad and extensive, as to include all of human conduct and govern in all the acts of life. They extend not only to the conduct of life and man's overt acts, but to the heart and motives that control it. Paul says: "It is quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart;" Heb. 4: 12; and the Psalmist says: "Thy commandment is exceeding broad." When Christ was asked by one

of the Pharisees, which was the great commandment in the law, he answered: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets?" Matth. 22: 25-40. We may see and infer from this, not only the extent of the decalogue, but its spiritual nature. It requires love to God as the impelling motive to obedience, for it alone can secure his favor, and provides for justice and charity to all men, by requiring that we love our neighbors as ourselves. Man's personal responsibility under the divine law also gives additional force to it and secures obedience. God has not only proclaimed the law, but has annexed the most solemn penalties to enforce it. The transgressor, by these divine sanctions, is constantly excited to conformity to its requirements so as to escape the penalties God has threatened against the evil doer, and thus the Bible, in which these penalties are set forth and enforced, is daily and hourly exerting its restraining influence upon society, and aids in sustaining it. The extent to which this influence is exerted, acting as it does directly on the hearts and consciences of men, and the benefits by it secured to society in all its interests, eternity only can reveal. Time cannot know them. They therefore who systematically seek to disparage its influence, and, if able, would destroy it altogether; who vainly imagine that the interests of society are secure without it and would have the institutions of life independent of God's control over them; who would cut loose society, if they could, from all association with religion and sacred things—such men, with all their pretensions to sincerity, in the language of holy writ, "know not what they do," and are "blind leaders of the blind." But we have no faith in their sincerity. They aim to exclude the Bible and its divine requirements from the associations and affairs of men, only that they may indulge in licentiousness with less restraint, and secure to crime a greater license. In regard to the ultimate consequences, either to others or themselves, they feel no concern, and as to the institutions of society and the well being of their fellow men under them, they are ready to reply as did Cain of old: "Am I my brother's keeper?" Again:

4. The sanctions of the Bible are essential to secure to society proper and adequate evidence of guilt and thereby it operates against the commission of crime. In the dark ages, when the human mind was buried in the rubbish centuries of

ignorance and superstition had imposed, and the Bible had become a sealed book to the world, society resorted to the most horrible and revolting methods for determining the guilt or innocence of those accused of crimes. Among others, besides that of *single combat*, the accused was thrown fettered into water, or made to walk, blindfold and with his feet naked, over hot bars of iron. The absurd presumption was assumed that, if innocent, he would be miraculously preserved, and escape unharmed. This they called *the ordeal*, or trial by judgment of God, and the accused, however innocent, was doomed to suffer its horrible exactions. As the name imports, it was truly a judgment upon their own ignorance and folly. Among the Greeks and Romans, equally absurd and superstitious modes prevailed for the same purpose. Compared with these, how humane and yet effectual, the modes of trial secured under the sanctions of the Bible! The accused here has secured to him the benefits of a fair and impartial investigation, his peers being his judges, and his fellow-men the only witnesses against him, who, on oath and under a full conviction of its sanctity, render their evidence accordingly. And in the multiplicity of trials that take place in our courts thus conducted, it seldom happens that the innocent are made to suffer, or that the guilty escape conviction, except where doubt still remains, which is properly allowed in favor of the accused, on the humane principle that ninety-nine guilty persons should escape, rather than that one innocent should suffer.

It is the Bible, however, and its divine sanctions, in our courts of justice, that secures to these forms of trial their sanctity and importance. The witnesses on oath testify as before God, and in view of the awful penalties God has annexed to perjury. Solemnly sworn to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, the witness thus testifies in the fear of God, and under a sense of his awful accountability, and although by false evidence he might save his fellow-man, yet knowing that he is guilty, the fear of God, inspired by his word, compels him to speak the truth, and he testifies in accordance with it. But take from the witness, the consciousness of responsibility to God referred to, as inculcated in his word, and you divest at once your modes of trial of all their solemnity and certainty, however regular their forms in other respects.

But the security of society rests upon the certainty that innocence will be protected and the guilty punished. "Rulers," says the Apostle, "are not a terror to good works, but to the evil." Rom. 13: 3. All government is designed for this end,

and the legislation conducted under its authority is intended to effect it. On its success depends the prosperity of all its interests. If in this it fails and crime should go unpunished; if the reckless and vicious have no authority to control them, and commit with impunity their deeds of outrage and violence, no other advantages can make amends for its defects in this respect, and sooner or later society would return to its elements and its best institutions perish. The Bible is, therefore, the foundation of its strength, the key-stone that binds the whole together and gives it durability. Without its solemn sanctions, its organisms, however well intended and skilfully contrived, could not exist, except in the rude and uncertain forms that characterize the associations of life where the Bible is unknown. Destroy then, its influence, and refuse its teachings; undermine its authority and remove its sanctions, and you unhinge society, and exchange its institutions, now securing the best interests of life, for the horrors of anarchy and the refinements of Paganism. You get rid of the Bible, but with it the blessings also God has designed it to impart. These are solemn truths, and more solemn from the fact, that if you reject the Bible you can substitute nothing in its stead that can impart to society the security it requires; nothing that can give durability to the institutions of life. This we have already shown, and we believe conclusively. We have seen it illustrated in the experience of all antiquity. The histories of Greece and Rome, with all the progress towards perfection made by them in learning and the arts of life, confirm the same. Philosophy, we have shown, has already exhausted all her powers, and can do no more. Moral systems, and the theories they reveal, as men have devised them, are impotent to enforce obedience, because no divinity is inscribed upon them. You turn then to reason as your last and final hope, reason enlightened but *not inspired*, and reason bewildered confesses that here her light is only darkness and that she cannot save you. The only security, then, society and its institutions can have, it must get from the Bible. Its authority is essential to sustain its varied interests, its divine sanctions are required to uphold them, and in rejecting it you reject the only hope its perpetuity can have. Finally:

5. *The retributions of the Bible are essential to the well being of society, and human organisms cannot be sustained without them.* By the retributions of the Bible we mean the *divine judgments* it reveals, appointed by God, as the portion of evil doers. We use the term *divine judgments*, because the retributions of God are his settled purposes in regard to the

wilfully disobedient and all workers of iniquity. They are already revealed, that the guilty may be warned, and by timely reformation and repentance may escape the wrath to come.

These retributions are not only eternal and affect man's condition hereafter, but are often temporal and so designed. Of this we have the fullest assurance in the word of God.—The history of the Old Testament is but a narrative of the special dealings of God with Israel and the nations with whom they were associated, especially those who dwelt upon the borders of Judea. Not only the Canaanites, expelled from Judea for their wickedness and idolatry, but the Assyrians, Persians, Medes and others, had often fearful evidence given them of the dealings of God with the nations of the world, and of his judgments which, says the Psalmist, "are in all the earth." Sodom and Gomorrah were utterly destroyed, and destroyed by God's direction as a judgment for their wickedness, as the Lord said to Abraham, who entreated God for them: "Because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great and *because their sin is very grievous.*" That ten righteous persons could not be found among them, upon which condition God had consented to spare them for his servant Abraham's sake, is sad evidence of their guilt. "Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven. And he overthrew those cities, and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of those cities, and that which grew upon the ground." Gen. 19: 24-26. This is the simple narrative as recorded by the pen of inspiration, and shows that God's judgments are executed even upon the earth, when the measure of human wickedness is full. That righteous Lot was saved from the burning city also shows that God is not indifferent to the actions of men, and that He deals with nations and individuals as they respectively deserve.

Concerning Nineveh we read as follows: "And the word of the Lord came unto Jonah the second time, saying, Arise, go unto Nineveh, that great city, and preach unto it the preaching that I bid thee. So Jonah arose, and went into Nineveh, according to the word of the Lord. (Now Nineveh was an exceeding great city of three days' journey.) And Jonah began to enter into the city a day's journey, and he cried and said, Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown. So the people of Nineveh believed God, and proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth, from the greatest of them even to the least of them. For the word came unto the king of Nineveh, and he arose from his throne and he laid his robe from him, and covered him with sackcloth, and sat in ashes. And he

caused it to be proclaimed and published through Nineveh (by the decree of the king and his nobles) saying, Let man and beast be covered with sackcloth and cry mightily unto God; yea, let them turn every one from his evil way, and from the violence that is in their hands. Who can tell if God will turn and repent, and turn away from his fierce anger, that we perish not. And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way; and God repented of the evil that he had said that he would do unto them and he did it not." *Jonah 3: 1-10.* We have given entire, or nearly so, the history of the event here recorded, because it illustrates the character of God's dealings with men, and shows that his threatened judgments, in the case of nations as well as of individuals, are executed or withheld as their deeds require. The final destruction of Jerusalem, by Titus, the Roman general, and the circumstances that attended it, especially the deliverance of the Christians among them from the impending ruin, is another confirmation of the same truth and of the teachings of revelation in regard to it. The Jews themselves, scattered and dispersed throughout the world, and disowned and persecuted every where, though once the favored people of God, and depositaries of his word, to whom for forty years in the wilderness, he was "a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night," whom he fed also "with bread from heaven," whom he suffered not their enemies to harm, and for whose deliverance one hundred and eighty-three thousand Assyrians were destroyed in a single night, to whom the Ark of God's Covenant with them was a refuge and defence; we say their subsequent and continued dispersion throughout the world, though favored as they once had been, is another and effecting illustration of the same great principle, and yet strictly in accordance with the teachings of God's word in regard to his providences, and the lessons of instruction to the world they are intended to teach. Other illustrations of the same great truth might be furnished, but those given are amply sufficient. If they hear not these, and the Bible is full of them, "neither would they be persuaded though one should come unto them from the dead." We have been thus particular, because we believe the judgments of God threatened in his word, are designed to act conservatively upon society and the institutions of life, as well as govern the conduct of men with reference to eternity. That they refer to nations as well as individuals is ample proof that they are so designed. That these retributions involve the interests of men for eternity, and tend to regulate human conduct with reference to man's happiness hereafter, only gives to

them additional force in their beneficial influence upon life and the institutions of time. But we depend upon the Bible for the influence they exert. Destroy its power, as the growing infidelity of the times aims to do, and you cut off society from its strongest safeguards, and remove from beneath its varied associations the firmest pillars upon which they rest. Nay, but weaken its moral influence upon man, the influence its just and righteous retributions exert, and you impair the foundations of society, and all the valued institutions of life to the same extent. Of the truth of this we are most firmly persuaded, and we warn our fellow men, especially those who have control in human affairs, to ponder its solemn reality. We warn the people of God, in these times of growing evil and iniquity, fraught with danger to all the interests of man both for time and eternity, to cleave more firmly than ever to the great truth in their holy religion which acknowledges a divine providence in human affairs, and we warn worldly men and ungodly statesmen, of the folly of all their theories which aim at substituting the perfection of human reason for "the wisdom that cometh from above," and at excluding God and divine influences from the affairs of men. These the Bible alone imparts. It alone has adequate sanctions to enforce them. Its moral agencies are the agencies of God himself exerted through his word; its retributions are his solemn judgments designed to govern the conduct of men as well in time as for eternity, and we add again, upon their remedial and conservative influences the best hopes of society depend. Nay, it cannot subsist without them.

We have attempted thus to show the dependance of society and its institutions upon the word of God and the varied influences it exerts. We have been more tedious than we intended, but could not have said less without weakening the force of reasoning depending upon its connection, to exhibit the conclusions it legitimately presents. We believe they establish fully the points intended, and hope they will prove as convincing to the minds of our readers as they have been to our own. We are among those who believe that, in reference to the affairs of time and the institutions of life, we depend upon God and the teachings of his word, as well as for eternity. We have no heart to sanction the growing idea of a God in religion, but the rejection of his influence in the government of human affairs. We believe man is as dependent upon his guidance and control in the one case as in the other, and the fact that practical infidelity too often controls in the institutions of life, by no means justifies the principle. Men may

choose to reject God altogether, both as to divine and human things, but their doing so will neither exclude God from the exercise of his rightful authority on the one hand, nor on the other exempt them from its control. It would only argue the blindness of human reason and the utter perversion of the human heart.

In conclusion, we add that we have no desire to disparage the force of human reason, or impair in the least the dignity of the human understanding. We attribute to it all it can justly claim. But we deny its sufficiency as a rule and a guide for man, either in human or divine things, independent of divine teaching and the guidance of him who made it. We have patiently traced its development in ancient and modern times, and under circumstances the most favorable for the exertion of its influence. We have seen its progress in letters, in science, in philosophy and in the arts of life. The ages of Grecian and Roman literature, as we have shown in the former part of these remarks, were eminently and deservedly distinguished. As already stated, we doubt whether, in the cycles of time that have succeeded, they have even been equalled, not to say surpassed. In the ages referred to, the human mind exerted its native vigor, and depended upon its own energies for the results it produced. It acted for itself, and was independent of the teachings of earlier ages to direct it. What it attempted, it attempted on its own authority, and not on that of intellects that had preceded it. It was eminently the age of invention in every department of learning and the arts, and wherein it failed, it still had the high merit of originality to commend it. Subsequent ages have enjoyed the benefits of its labors, and withal have seldom done more than copied, or at most elaborated the principles it established. But after all its advances, in the ages referred to, the mind failed to develop any theory for society, by which with certainty its objects could be secured or its institutions perpetuated. In the progress of time, and of ages reaching from a remote antiquity, we are met by the rise and fall of nation after nation and kingdom after kingdom. The mightiest empires of the world seem only to have been formed to give in their downfall a more striking illustration of the want of inherent power to endure and the instability of human things. The Assyrian, Persian, Medean and Egyptian, are named among the first great kingdoms of the world, and were succeeded by others no less powerful than those that preceded them. But we only read of them, that they rose and flourished and passed away. Their mighty cities, with all the monuments of genius

and art they contained, though adorned with palaces and temples, with obelisks and statues that seemed imperishable, have passed away with them. Nineveh, even the great city of Nineveh referred to, that God spared because it repented at the preaching of his prophet, has long since crumbled into dust, and its name only remains registered among the things that have been. Babylon, the Great, the queen city of the east, distinguished alike for her opulence and power; whose Semiramis reigned and Sardanapalus revelled in luxury and wantonness; whose palaces the riches of the east adorned, and whose breezes were perfumed by odors wafted by gardens floating in the air; whose fortresses were impregnable and her walls made strong by mighty towers—in time she ceased to be, and nought but desolation marks the spot where once stood the proudest city of antiquity. But the prophets of God had foretold her doom, and it was executed most fearfully.—Isaiah thus predicts her melancholy end: “Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldee’s excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation; neither shall the Arabian pitch his tent there; neither shall the shepherds make their fold there. But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and owls shall dwell there, and satyrs shall dance there. And the wild beasts of the islands shall cry in their desolate houses; and dragons in their pleasant palaces: and her time is near to come, and her days shall not be prolonged.” Isa. 13: 19–22. The readers of history need not be told how true to the letter, is the terrible description given by the prophet here, of the utter desolation of this once mighty but devoted city. But the cause of it they may have overlooked. The same Prophet has recorded it. God says: “I will cause the arrogance of the proud to cease, and will lay low the haughtiness of the terrible.” Paul says: “The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men,” and all history confirms it. Shall we not learn instruction, then, from the teachings of the past, and make the sad experience of other ages and of nations long since overthrown for their iniquity, available for our security? But what was their iniquity for which they were destroyed? The Apostle, by inspiration, gives the true answer: “Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed

the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four footed beasts and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness," Rom. 1: 21-24. Their sin was their rejection of God and his government over them. They did not like to retain God even in their thoughts, much less acknowledge him in the affairs of life. And as they first rejected him, so God finally rejected them, and when the measure of their iniquity was full, he gave them over to destruction. As it was with the nations and cities of antiquity already named, so it was with the rest, and so it will be again to the end of time. Rejecting God and the counselings of his word, human reason could not save them. No progress in letters or in the arts could make amends for this or supply its place. Much less, when these only tended to darken the understanding in regard to God and lead it further from the truth.

For these reasons, therefore, as already stated, we have no confidence in the sufficiency of human reason for any thing tending to the honor of God and the good of man, where it assumes to act independently of God and the influences he has ordained to govern it. Our trust is in his word alone, as much so in human as in divine affairs; in things temporal as well as in thing spiritual and eternal. He is to be acknowledged in all man's ways, and success can attend his pathway in life alone when this is done. His word is to be his shield and buckler—his "pillar of cloud by day and pillar of fire by night." It is to be his rule of duty as well as of faith—of practice as well as hope—his guide for time as well as for eternity. Apart from it he can hope for nothing. Without it he will grope his way in darkness; and rejecting it, sooner or later, the just retributions of an avenging God will be his portion. God will speedily cut him off, and that without remedy. Our help is then here and not in man; not in the multitude of his counsels, or in the works his hands have formed; not in governors, kings or princes. But our trust is in the Lord, and with David we add: "*Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord, and the people whom he hath chosen for his own inheritance.*"

ARTICLE II.

THE NATURE OF THE SAVIOUR'S PRESENCE IN THE
EUCHARIST.

By S. S. Schmucker, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary,
Gettysburg.

WHEN the Divine Author of our holy religion, gave us an inspired, written record of its sacred principles, precepts and institutions, through the men whom he had personally instructed; he also taught us to regard this record as a sufficient rule of faith and practice, as able to make us, individually, "wise unto salvation." Through these same honored instruments he informs us, "that all scripture was given by inspiration," for the express purpose, "that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work." To the close of the whole canon, that is, to the last (as we believe) of the inspired books, the Revelation of St. John, the Saviour appended this solemn warning, speaking in his own person: "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. If any man shall add unto these things, God will add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the tree (var. lect. for *Bēzēd*, book) of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." Rev. 22: 18, 19.

From these solemn declarations it is evident, that God will hold every man to strict responsibility for the conformity of his religious opinions to the teachings of the inspired word; and therefore in forming our doctrinal views we ought to study the utmost possible objectivity, ought to labor to divest ourselves of all preconceived opinions either for one or other interpretation of a disputed point, and let the Scripture as much as possible be made to interpret itself. These remarks are peculiarly applicable to the doctrine which is at present to claim our attention. It has been a bone of contention in the Protestant church, with but little intermission, ever since its origin, until about fifty years ago, when the Lutheran church almost universally abandoned the views, which Luther and his co-laborers, with few exceptions, entertained. We therefore feel the deepest obligation, in endeavoring to investigate this subject,

to be governed entirely by the word of God, interpreted according to the correct principles of common sense, which is the only true system of Historical Exegesis.

Let us *first* briefly recall to mind those principles of Hermeneutics, which particularly come into question in these passages of Scripture on this subject.

§ 1. *General Principles of Interpretation.*

1. The general nature of language implies, that the words of a speaker be regarded as definite signs of his ideas, and that the signification of these signs is *conventional*: that is, the signs or sounds called words derive their meaning, not from their intrinsic structure, but from the current practice or usage of the people at the time they are employed. Thus, Σῶμα signifies body, σὰρξ flesh, and αἷμα blood, ἄρτος bread, and οἶνος wine, simply in consequence of conventional usage. The few words in different languages, which express sounds not unlike that of the words themselves, such as roar, crash, &c. are, like some of the admired lines of Virgil or Homer, in which the sounds of the whole sentence bears some analogy to the idea expressed, but exceptions which confirm the general rule.

2. The language of Scripture and of inspiration, does not differ from other language in its general principles. That this would be the case, might *a priori* be expected: for if it were otherwise, such language would not be intelligible. As words in any language convey to the hearer, not whatever ideas the speaker may choose, but those of which conventional usage has made them the authorized exponents: the inspired writers could be intelligible on no other supposition. Accordingly it is admitted by all enlightened exegetical writers, that the language of Scripture must be investigated on precisely the same principles which are applied to uninspired language.

The actual examination of the Scriptures *a posteriori*, proves the above expectation, or supposition, to be correct. The diversity of style, of literary excellence, and of psychological peculiarity, belonging to the different books, incontestably establishes the homogeneity of the language of the Bible with that of uninspired writers. Generally, the Scriptures have been interpreted on this supposition by the great mass of Christians in all ages, and found to be intelligible.

3. The rules of Sacred Hermeneutics must therefore also, like those of Hermeneutics in general, be based on the nature and general principles of language, and arise out of them.

Thus we must study the historical import of the individual words employed: the context and scope of the passage must

be investigated, the circumstances and design of the writer are to be examined, and in short all the light of archæology is to be employed, to ascertain what ideas the passage in question would have conveyed to the persons of the age and country, to whom they were first addressed. The sense thus acquired is to be regarded as the true one, and is termed the historical sense. Luther himself in most instances practiced on this system, and termed the signification thus acquired the *literal* sense.

4. Experience however proves, that in fact, general usage has, in all languages, given different significations to many words. The causes of this fact, we will not here stop to discuss; its reality is undisputed, and familiar to all.

That signification of a word, in which it is most commonly employed, is usually termed its natural or *literal* import. The others are called *figurative*.

The *figurative* meanings of words are of various kinds, metaphysical, typical, allegorical, &c. &c.

5. Yet the great mass of men ordinarily employ words, in their natural, most obvious, and *literal* sense.

Therefore, a sound rule of interpretation is, that *the literal sense must be adhered to in the interpretation of all authors sacred or profane, until reasons occur to justify us in deviating from it.*

6. Such reasons, however, often occur both in sacred and profane authors, and then a deviation from the literal sense becomes necessary.

These reasons are 1) When the passage literally interpreted *contradicts natural reason, common sense*, or the testimony of our senses.

Thus, when in Psalm 18: 2. and elsewhere, God is termed "a *rock*, a *fortress*, a *buckler*, a *high tower*:" when the Saviour says, (John 15: 1.) "I am the true *vine* — ye are the *branches*" — or "I am the *door*," 10: 9: or when Paul says, 1 Cor. 10: 4. "That *rock* was Christ," or "Christ our *pass-over*," was slain for us, &c.; or Matth. 13: 38, 39: "The *field* is the world — the *seed* is the *word*, &c. the enemy is the devil." See also Matth. 8: 22; or in Gethsemane when Jesus says, "Father, if it be possible let this *cup*," this trial of affliction, pass away. This rule is based on the universally conceded proposition, that the testimony of our senses fairly and fully ascertained, is stronger than any other evidence, which might seem to overturn it; and that the obvious and conceded teachings of common sense and reason are also true.

2) We must depart from the literal sense, when the passage literally interpreted, *contradicts the well known opinions of the author*, or in regard to the Bible, contradicts some other portions of Scripture, and the passage naturally, in accordance with the laws of language, admits another meaning, that does not labor under these difficulties. Thus, the command of the Saviour: "If thy hand, or foot, or eye offend thee, cut it off, or pluck it out," &c. Matth. 18: 9, 10. literally interpreted contradicts the command in the decalogue, "thou shalt not kill," and therefore the literal sense cannot be retained.

3) The deviation from the literal sense is the more natural and allowable, when the composition is *poetic*, in which figurative language naturally abounds, in all languages and among all nations.

4) Also, in popular discourses and even narrative compositions, when the speaker is in the habit of employing figurative style.

Thus, after we know from the discourses of the Saviour in general, that often, very often, he speaks in parables, and employs various kinds of figurative expressions; it is the more probable, that his meaning in a disputed passage is figurative also, and it is the more obligatory on us to adopt a tropical interpretation, when a literal one labors under difficulties. We need not enumerate the parables of the Saviour. It is well known that his discourses are more frequently parabolical or figurative, in some form or other, than literal.

This is also very frequently the case in regular historical and didactic composition in all languages, although the figures occurring are of a more modest nature, are metaphysical, rather than allegorical. The tropes are rarely kept up through a whole narrative.

Such a figurative mode of speaking, is more usual among the orientals in general, than among the other civilized nations.

Having thus sketched out the general principles of hermeneutics, so far as they have an immediate bearing on the portions of Holy Writ relating to the Supper of our Lord; we proceed in the *second* place, to their application. We shall inquire what is the literal import of the words of the institution; whether sufficient difficulties oppress the literal sense to justify its rejection; what are the several tropical or figurative significations of which the words in question admit; and which of these commends itself most strongly to our judgment and conscience, as most accordant with the legitimate principles of interpretation.

§ 2. *The Literal Sense of the Words of the Institution.*

What is the literal sense of the Gospel narrative of the institution of the Lord's Supper? Matth 26: 26. (Mark 14: 22. Luke 22: 19. 1 Cor. 11: 23, 24.)

Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν, λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν ἄρτον, καὶ εὐλογῆσας, [or according to a various reading, ἐχαριστήσας] ἔκλασε, καὶ ἰδίᾳ τοῖς μαθηταῖς, καὶ εἶπε· Λάβετε, φάγετε· τὸ ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμά μου. Literally this means, "But whilst they were eating, Jesus took the bread (or loaf), and having offered prayer or pronounced a blessing, (but not blessed *it*, the bread, "*it*" not being found in the Greek,) he break and gave to his disciples, and said, Take, eat, this (bread) is my body (that is, is no longer bread, but is my body, and having been bread when I took it up, and being now my body, it must have been changed from one substance into another, that is it must have been transubstantiated)."—We therefore see, that the Romish doctrine is really the literal, and only literal one. And it cannot be consistently denied, that if we are to disregard the testimony of the senses, and to suppose a miracle in the case, the doctrine of papal transubstantiation is the legitimate sense of this passage.

The same remarks and inferences are equally appropriate to the language of the Saviour touching the wine, as given by Matthew 26: 27–29. Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τὸ γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα μου, &c. That is, literally, *Drink ye all out of it (out of this cup), for this (bowl or cup) is (no longer a cup, but) is my blood.* Hence as it was a bowl or cup when he took it into his hands, and was thereafter no longer a cup, but was his blood, it must have been changed from one substance into another: and here again we have the papal transubstantiation as the legitimate and only result of the literal interpretation. Yet after all even the papists do not adhere faithfully to the literal import here, as they suppose the "cup" (ποτήριον) to be used *figuratively* for the wine contained in it.

This Romish interpretation is wisely rejected by the whole Protestant world, for the following satisfactory reasons:

a) It is contradicted by the clear and indisputable testimony of our senses, which demonstrate that no change has taken place in the nature and properties of the bread and wine. We have this testimony not of our senses only, but of sight, taste, smell and touch. Nor the four senses of one individual only, but of all men, of every generation and country, where the rite has been celebrated. But no testimony is so strong as that of the senses; because on it rests our belief even of the Scriptures.

b) It contradicts the universal observation of mankind, that all bodies (material substances) must occupy definite portions of space, and cannot be at more than one place at one time: for according to this interpretation, every portion of consecrated bread is really the whole material body of the Saviour; hence the whole body is locally present in many different places at the same time, which is absurd.

c) The Apostle still calls the symbols bread and wine, *after* their consecration; which he would not have done, if they had been transmuted into the body and blood of the Saviour. 1 Cor. 10: 16. 11: 26.

d) Because the bread and wine are subject to the same law of decomposition and corruption as if they were not consecrated.

e) Because it was a comparatively recent doctrine, unknown in the Christian church generally, until about a thousand years after this ordinance was instituted.¹

§ 3. *The first figurative interpretation (by Luther.)*

What is the first *figurative* interpretation of the words of the institution?

It is that of Luther, and his coadjutors in the sixteenth century, retained by the great mass of the Lutheran church till half a century ago from some apparent scriptural authority aided by respect for Luther, and the penalties which followed the rejection of a material feature of the state religion. It amounts to this: The words of the Saviour, "Take, eat, *τὸ ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα μου,*" (take, eat, this is my body) mean, "*Take eat this bread, which is not my body, and remains bread, but which is the outward element, in, with or under which my true body is truly and substantially present, and is distributed with the bread, and received by the mouth, by all communicants.*"²

¹ See the writer's Popular Theology, 5th edit. p. 296, &c.

² That there may be no doubt in the minds of those unacquainted with the symbolical books, as to the accuracy of our representation of the views taught in them on the subject of the real presence, we annex several proof passages:

1) The Augsburg Confession says (Art. X.): "The true (*wahre*), or real body and blood of Christ are verily (assuredly, truly, "*wahrhaftig*lich") present, and distributed and received by the communicants, &c.

2) The Apology to the Confession Art. X, states: "The tenth Article (of the Augsburg. Conf.) is not objected to by our opponents, in which we confess that the body and blood of the Lord are truly and substantially (*vere et substantialiter*) present, and tendered and received, as the Romish church has hitherto believed (*wie man bis anher in der Kirchen gehalten hat*). That is, the Augsburg Confession was intended by him who wrote it, and was under-

The language of Jesus relative to the wine, Drink ye all out of it (the cup), *αὐτὸ γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ αἶμα μου*, &c. (for this is my blood), is to be thus interpreted: "*Drink ye all of this wine, which is not my blood, and remains wine, but which is the outward element, in, with, or under which my true blood is truly and substantially present and is distributed with the wine, and is received by the mouth by all communicants*"

The objections to this interpretation, are very similar to those which oppress the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation.

a) It contradicts the clear and indisputable testimony of our senses. This theory requires us to believe, that the true body of Christ is actually and *substantially*, or as the German copy says, *essentially* present, and yet it cannot be perceived by our senses. The body of Christ, whilst on earth, was always perceptible by the senses like other bodies: and even after his resurrection and glorification, whenever he was present at any place, his *glorified body* also was perceptible, even the nail prints in his hands and the wounds in his side. This glorified body, like that of believers in general, will still be a body, however elevated and refined in its properties; and being a body, it remains matter, and like all human bodies, visible and tangible.

stood to teach the actual presence of the real body and blood of Christ, in the sense in which it had been taught by the Romish church generally, and also by the Greeks.

3) The Form of Concord Pars I, § VII, De Cæna Domini, employs the following language, affirming that the body and blood of Christ are *truly and substantially* (or, as to the German copy states, *essentially*) present: "Quæritur an in sacra Cæna, verum corpus et verus sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi vere et *substantialiter* sint presentia, atque cum pane et vino distribuantur et ore sumantur ab omnibus illis qui hoc sacramentum utuntur—Cingliani negant—nos vero asseveramus." "Ob in dem Heiligen Abendmahl, der wahrhaftige Leib und Blut unseres Herrn Jesu Christi *wahrhaftig und wesentlich* gegenwärtig sei, mit Brodt und Wein ausgetheilt, und *mit dem Munde* empfangen werde, von allen so sich dieses Sacraments gebrauchen.—Die Sacramentirer sagen nein, wir sagen ja." We are aware, that the Form of Concord rejects the idea of a gross *Cupernailish* eating and drinking in the eucharist, according to which the flesh of the Redeemer is manducated by the teeth, and digested like other food. Müller Symb. Books, p. 543. It would therefore be the height of injustice to charge the adherents of the symbols with believing these consequences. Yet, if they properly flow from their doctrine, they may justly be alleged as objections to the doctrine itself, by all who regard them as its legitimate consequences.

They further pronounce the mode of eating and drinking to be a "*spiritual*" one, to which, in its natural import, we would not object; but they also add, we believe that the body and blood of Christ are received *not only spiritually* by faith, but also *by the mouth*;" and those are condemned who affirm that this reception is "*only spiritual* by faith," and not *oral*. The symbolical books also claim for the glorified body of Christ, by virtue especially of the hypostatic union, the possession of properties different from those of other

It cannot indeed be denied, that God by *a miracle* might so interpose as to make the body of the Saviour invisible on sacramental occasions; but where is the intimation in any part of the narrative, that there should be a miracle wrought? Or is there the least shadow of evidence, that the apostles thought any thing miraculous had occurred? Do they manifest any surprise? Certainly not, and we have therefore no authority to suppose the existence of a miracle.

b) It also contradicts the observation of all ages and nations, that all bodies, (material substances) must occupy definite portions of space; and cannot be at more than one place at the same time. According to this view, the body of Christ must be able to occupy different portions of space at the same time. It must be here, and in New York and Boston, and London and in Africa, and in Asia, at the same time, if Christians are simultaneously celebrating the holy supper; and yet his body was a human body like our own, whilst on earth, and even after its glorification, was confined to one place at a time as it had been before. When the glorified Redeemer appeared to Mary Magdalene at the tomb, he was not also with his disciples in Jerusalem. When he appeared to Cleopas and another disciple on the way to Emmaus, he was not simultaneously among the apostles in Jerusalem. When he appeared to the assembled apostles in the absence of Thomas, Thomas did not see him elsewhere at the same time. When he was on the mount in Galilee, or at the sea of Tiberias, or finally

matter, and even of other glorified bodies. Yet as this assumption is regarded as gratuitous by those who reject this doctrine, they, of course, do not admit its force. And it deserves to be ever remembered, that only fourteen years after the Form of Concord was published, Duke Frederick William, during the minority of Christian II, published the VISITATION ARTICLES OF SAXONY, in 1594, in order to suppress the Melancthonian tendencies to reject this and other peculiarities of the symbols, the article on this subject, framed by men confessedly adhering to the old symbols, and designing to re-annunciate their true import, and enforced upon the whole Church in Saxony as symbolic, gives the most objectionable view of this doctrine: I. "The pure doctrine of our Church is, that the words *Take and eat, this is my body: drink, this is my blood*, are to be understood simply and according to the letter." II. That the body (which is received and eaten) is the proper and natural body (der rechte natürliche Leib) of Christ, *which hung upon the cross; and the blood (which is drunk) is the proper and natural blood* (das rechte, natürliche Blut), *which flowed from the side of Christ.*" Müller's Symb. Books, p. 847. Now we cannot persuade ourselves, that this is the view of a single minister of the General Synod, or of many out of it; and yet these are the views they are obligated to receive, if they avow implicit allegiance to the former symbolical books of our Church in Europe. If they adopt the modification received by many of our distinguished divines, such as Mosheim, Reinhardt and others, they do not faithfully embrace the symbolical doctrine, and should not profess to do so.

at Bethany, whence he ascended; he was seen no where else. In short, his body seems to have been as much confined to one locality at one time after his resurrection, as before his death. Since, therefore, we have no intimation in the Scriptures, that glorified bodies in general can occupy different portions of space at the same time, and since the body of Christ after his resurrection did in every instance appear under this restriction to one locality, and there is no intimation of a miracle in the Eucharist; the evidence all seems to be against the doctrine of the real presence of the body of Christ at the eucharist, at different places, at the same time.

Nor can the assumption of the Form. of Concord (Müller p. 667-8.), that the *body* of Christ possesses two other modes of presence, beside the local presence, be sustained, either by reason or the word of God. The alleged "*spiritual*" presence of the Saviour's *body*, is a contradiction in terms. And the other, the "*divine or heavenly*" presence, which is attributed to his body in common with the Deity, is wholly unscriptural as well as opposed to the essential unchangeable difference between the creature and the Creator, the finite and the Infinite.

c) This interpretation cannot be correct, because the glorified body, which is said to be received with the elements, had actually not yet any existence, and therefore could not have been given by the Saviour to his disciples at the Holy Supper. The idea, that it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be at the same time, is not only an immutable law of all created things; so far as the human mind can perceive, it is applicable to the Deity himself, and it is usually admitted, that things contradictory in their nature, are not embraced in the range of the divine omnipotence. Hence if Christ had intended his supper for this purpose, he would have told his disciples, "Ye cannot indeed now receive this supper in its proper import, nor receive my body in it, as I am yet alive and amongst you;" or rather if it had been the intention of Christ to give us his real glorified body in the eucharist, he would have deferred the institution of the ordinance till after his resurrection, or have left it to his apostles to institute it, after he had wholly left this world, and ascended to his heavenly glory.

d) The eucharist could not have conferred the *broken* body to the disciples at its institution; because it was not yet broken, crucified, dead: nor to the followers of Christ after his resurrection, because it no longer exists in a broken, dead state, but in a risen, reanimated, glorified condition. Therefore the words *ταυτο εστι*, "this is," must of necessity have been figura-

tively understood by the disciples at the time of their delivery, in the institution of the supper.

e) The old Lutheran theory cannot be correct, according to the language of Christ; because he says, Luke 22: 19. "Do this in remembrance of me," *ὡς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, i. e. in mei recordationem, (Schleusner,) in commemoration of me; but we perform an act in remembrance of any person or event, only when it is *past* and *absent*. We deliver a sermon in commemoration or memory of the Reformation, or of General Washington, only because they are past and absent. Even when we commemorate the deeds of living men, those deeds must be past, which are to constitute the burden of our eulogy.

f) That the doctrine of the *real presence* cannot be true, is proved by those passages of scripture, which represent Christ as having left this world, as having returned to the Father, and as being seated at his right hand in heaven; John 16: 28. "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go to the Father." Matth. 26: 11. "For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always." John 16: 7. "It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." We are told by the Saviour himself, not to yield credence to such as say, "Lo, here is Christ or there." Matth. 24: 23.

When he took his final leave of his disciples, Luke tells us, "he was carried up into heaven." And although the Saviour left on record the delightful promise, that he would be always with his disciples till the end of the world; it was in his *divine* nature, which is omnipresent; and his next *visible* appearance, the angels informed the men of Galilee at his ascension, would again be from heaven in like manner, as they had seen him ascend. Acts 1: 11.

In Acts 3: 21, Peter declares, that "The heavens must receive him until the times of the restitution (*ἀποκατάστασις*, fulfilment or accomplishment) of all the things, which God had spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began." We are told by Paul, "That the Lord will descend from heaven as with the voice of an archangel," 1 Thess. 4: 16.; and again, the same inspired writer exhorts the Colossians, "Seek those things which are above, where Christ *sitteth on the right hand of God*." 3: 1. Now whilst all these passages and many others, teach us that Christ has left this world, and is now seated in heaven, we know of not a single passage which intimates that he is present at any sacramental celebration. But if it were true, that his body, which was last seen

ascending to heaven, is all the while present on earth, at one or other place where the supper is commemorated, and often at thousands of places at the same moment; is it unreasonable to suppose, that such a remarkable fact, such an almost incessant miracle in the church of all ages, would at least be alluded to in a single instance in the New Testament?

g) Again, whilst the idea, that Christ is figuratively represented as the *spiritual food* of the believer, is a delightful, consoling and becoming one; the supposition that the believer is to eat the actual flesh of his best friend, and drink his real blood, is a gross, repulsive and unnatural idea, which nothing but the clearest evidence would authorize us to adopt. The eating of flesh and blood even of beasts was forbidden by the Jewish law, Gen. 9: 4. with how much more horror would the disciples of the Saviour have been filled, had they understood him as enjoining on them habitually to eat and drink his body and blood? Yet they exhibit no indication of such horror or surprise, and therefore did not understand the Saviour as requiring such a repulsive act. Yea the council of apostles and elders, at Jerusalem, after the Saviour's death, prohibit the eating of blood; Acts 15: 28. Hence it is not surprising that, amid the long catalogue of Protestant creeds, of every denomination, there is not a single one, which adopts this doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the eucharist, except the Augsburg Confession and the other former symbolical books of our church. Several Protestant symbols do indeed employ language seemingly implying this doctrine, but they explain it away in other passages, so that this doctrine is not understood to belong to any other church. We know the Form of Concord rejects the idea of gross Carnalistic eating; but it at the same time denies that it is mere figurative eating, eating by faith alone, and between literal and figurative eating of a real body of flesh and blood, there is no third or intermediate mode of eating conceivable. The term "*spiritual*" is used by the Form of Concord; but applied to eating and drinking material flesh and blood, it must signify figurative eating, or it signifies nothing intelligible at all.

But are there no arguments in favor of the doctrine of the real presence?

There are several expressions, in the portion of Scripture discussing this subject, which have been supposed to favor Luther's interpretation. At first view, and especially in our vulgar version, they may seem to possess the appearance of force; yet on close examination, this will disappear, especially before the mass of contrary evidence, pervading the whole passage.

1. 1 Cor. 11 : 29. : "Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup (wine) of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," *ἰνοχος ἔσται τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου* : "shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord;" that is, "shall commit sin in regard to the body and blood of the Lord," namely, by treating the solemnly appointed commemoration of them, with levity or irreverence. It has been said, "How could we be guilty of the body of Christ, if it were not present?" We answer: To be guilty of the body, means in the original, to be guilty or commit sin in reference to the body; that is, to make the body of Christ the occasion of committing sin. And must not all admit, that we can and often do commit sin in regard to absent persons or things? May we not sin, or be guilty in regard to an absent friend, by slandering or even thinking ill of him, just as well as when he is present? Do we not insult the majesty of an absent king, when we treat with indignity a monument or other memorial which has been established in honor of him? And the unworthy communicant is specifically said to have been guilty in reference to the *body* of Christ, because it was his body, which was specially represented by the symbols which he treats irreverently in the Lord's Supper. He is guilty of treating with irreverence, that sacred institution, which the Saviour appointed under the most affecting circumstances, to commemorate the breaking of his body and shedding of his blood upon the cross, and thus commits sin in regard to the body and blood of the Lord. Thus, James 2 : 10. the phrase "*guilty of*" *ἰνοχος*, is used in the same general acceptation : Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet shall offend in one point, is guilty of all (*ἡγορεῖ πάντων νόμων ἰνοχος*), commits sin in regard to them all.

The reason of their guilt is further described by Paul thus, "*not discerning the Lord's body*," that is, not distinguishing between ordinary bread and these consecrated symbols of the Lord's body and blood. *Ernesti* justly remarks,¹ that this use of the term employed by the Apostle, ("discerning" *διακρίνων*), originated from the Jewish habit of distinguishing clean from unclean meats according to the law of Moses.—Those were said not to discern or distinguish the meats, who ate indiscriminately both clean and unclean or forbidden meats. See Ezek. 44 : 23. This remark is the more important, as the Apostle Paul had, in the previous context (10 : 18 & 27.), spoken of things offered in sacrifice both by the Jews and Gentiles.

¹ Opusc. theol. p. 136.

2. The other passage is 1 Cor. 10: 16. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? "οὐχι (το ποτήριον) κοινωνία το σώματος το Χριστοῦ ἐστι;" — "(τοῦ ἁγίου) οὐχι κοινωνία το σώματος το Χριστοῦ ἐστι;"

Κοινωνία. The term *κοινωνία*, *communion*, has several significations in the N. T. 1, communication or bestowment of a benefit, beneficence. See Rom. 15: 26. 2 Cor. 9: 13.

2, conjunction, society, spiritual communion. Acts 2: 42. And they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and *fellowship*, (*κοινωνία*). 1 Cor. 1: 9. God is faithful by whom ye were called to the *fellowship* (*κοινωνία*), of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

2 Cor. 6: 14. What *communion* (*κοινωνία*) community of interest, or adaptation for close union, hath light (the children of light, christians,) with darkness, (the children of darkness, "unbelievers").

2 Cor. 13: 13. The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God, and the *communion* (*κοινωνία*), of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.

Gal. 2: 9. And when James, Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of *fellowship* (*κοινωνία*).

Ephes. 3: 9. And to make all men see what is the fellowship (*κοινωνία*) which hath been hid in God.

Philipp. 1: 5. I thank my God—for your fellowship (*κοινωνία*) in the Gospel from the first day until now.

— 2: 1. If there be—any fellowship (*κοινωνία*) of the Spirit,—fulfil ye my joy, &c.

— 3: 10. That I may know the power of his resurrection and the fellowship (*κοινωνία*) of his sufferings.

Phil. v. 6. That the communication (*κοινωνία*) of thy faith may become effectual.

1 John 1: 3. 6. 7. That ye also may have *fellowship* (*κοινωνία*) with us, &c.

As to the Lutheran and Romish interpretation, which supposes this passage to teach the actual presence of the body and blood of Christ, it is liable to all the objections above enumerated in regard to that doctrine. But a moral signification, as is evident from the passages just quoted, is far more agreeable to the *usus loquendi*, and is perfectly easy and natural. The cup of the blessing—is it not the communion, does it not bring us *spiritually* into communion with the body of Christ, &c. In the same sense it is said of the Jews in v. 18:

"are not they who eat of the sacrifices, partakers of the altar? ουχι — κοινωροι του θυσιαστηρις εστι, in communion with the altar? here we find *the very same word* κοινωροι employed, and yet who would infer, that the Jews ate the God whom they worshipped, or the altar on which they sacrificed, or any thing more than the outward offerings? In like manner in the next verse (20.), "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils or demons, — and I would not that ye should have fellowship, communion (κοινωνους των δαιμονιων γινεσθαι) with devils. Who would suppose, that the Gentiles in their sacrifices had communion with the bodies of the dead heroes and demigods whom they worshipped? Yet if the word κοινωρια and κοινωνης in the one case means the actual participation of the flesh and blood of the being commemorated, what reason can be assigned for its having so different a signification in the other? The language in both cases is substantially the same, yea the identical word, only in one case used substantively, and with the other adjectively. If then the words mean, that the sacramental communicant receives the flesh and blood of Christ, in addition to the outward elements, they also teach, that the partakers at heathen altars, likewise eat the flesh and drink the blood of those heroes and demigods to whom they offer sacrifice.

In addition to the scriptural passages in favor of the presence of the body of the Saviour in the Lord's Supper, there is a theological argument or theory, which though in part rejected by Luther himself, was adopted by some of his followers, and about a quarter of a century after his death, was introduced in its full development into the Form of Concord, which became the standard of Lutheran orthodoxy in some parts of Germany. Luther's view of the personal union of the two natures in Christ he thus judiciously expresses: If it should be objected on the ground of reason, "That the Godhead cannot suffer nor die; you must answer: That is true; nevertheless as the divinity and humanity in Christ constitute one person, therefore the Scriptures, on account of this personal unity, also attribute every thing to the Deity, which occurred to the humanity, and vice versa. This is moreover accordant with truth; for you must affirm that the person (Christ) suffers and dies. Now the person is the true God, therefore it is proper to say, the Son of God suffers. For although one part (if I may so speak) namely the Godhead does not suffer; still the person, which is God, suffers in its other part, that is in its humanity (denn obwohl das eine Stück (dasz ich so rede) als die Gottheit nicht leidet; so leidet dennoch die Person,

welche Gott ist, am andern Stücke, als an der Menschheit). Thus we say, The king's son has a sore, and yet it is only his leg that is affected: Solomon is wise, and yet it is only his soul which possesses wisdom: Absalom is beautiful, and yet it was only his body that is referred to: Peter is gray, and yet it is only his head of which this is affirmed. For as soul and body constitute but one person, every thing which happens either to the body or the soul, yea even to the smallest member of the body is justly and properly attributed to the whole person. This mode of expression is not peculiar to the Scriptures, but prevails throughout the world, and is also correct. Thus the Son of God was in truth crucified for us, that is, the person which is God; for this person, I say, was crucified according to its humanity." (Luth. Works, Jena edit. vol. 3. p. 457.) Yet Luther also sometimes employed language inconsistent with the statements which he here makes. The theory above referred to was claimed by its advocates as a legitimate sequence of the hypostatic union of the two natures of Christ, and is known as the *Communicatio Idiomatum*, or supposed reciprocal communication of attributes between the two natures of the Saviour, one result of which is to be, that his body now possesses *ubiquity*; and therefore can not only be present simultaneously wherever the Holy Supper is administered, but actually is present every where else in the universe. In support of this opinion several Scripture passages are alleged:

Coloss. 2: 9. For in him dwelleth the fullness of the God-head *bodily*," σωματικῶς. This passage we think naturally signifies, In Christ the real not imaginary, the full divinity and not an inferior deity dwells; that is, with his human nature the truly divine nature is really not figuratively, or typically, but actually united σωματικῶς personally, that is, into one person. This signification of the term σῶμα, as signifying person, is found both in the N. T. and in classic Greek. James 3: 6. So is the tongue among our members that it defileth the whole body, i. e. person (ὅλον τὸ σῶμα), for certainly the fact, that "the tongue is a world of iniquity," does not consist in its polluting the literal body, but the person, the character of the individual. Thus also Xenophon uses σώματα ἐλευθέρων for free men, free persons. Lycurgus and Aeschynes employ σῶμα in the same sense, to signify a person. The same usage meets us in the Latin language: Longeque ante omnia corpora Nisus emicat. Æneid v. l. 318, where the reference is to the person in general. And even in our own tongue, the term body has the

same meaning, in such phrases as "some body," "no body," &c. for some person, no person, &c.

John 3: 34. "For God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him," (but ἀμετρως). This may signify, that the inspiration of the Holy Spirit did not rest on the Saviour, only at particular times and in a limited degree, as it did on the prophets of the Old Testament; but at all times and in an unlimited degree. Or the idea may be, that the actual or entire divinity dwelt in him, i. e. was personally united with him. But there is certainly no intimation in it of the transfer of the divine attributes to the humanity of Christ.

Matth. 28: 18. "All power (πᾶσα ἐξουσία all *authority*, not πᾶσα δυνάμις) is given unto me in heaven and on earth." This certainly does not signify power, omnipotence; but all or full *authority* to command and direct all things on earth to the accomplishment of the purposes of his mediatorial reign.

In this sense the word (ἐξουσία), translated *power* in the passage under consideration, is often employed in the New Testament. Thus, Matth. 21: 23. the chief priests and elders came to him, when he was teaching and said: "By what *authority* (ἐξουσία) doest thou these things?" And (7: 29.) the people were astonished at his doctrine, "For he taught them as one having *authority* (ἐξουσία), and not as the scribes." In the same general sense, as signifying authority, liberty, &c., having no reference to omnipotence or physical power, this word is employed in many other passages, so that the declaration of the Saviour, "All power or authority is given to me," has no necessary reference to physical power or omnipotence. See Matth. 9: 6. Mark 2: 10. Luke 5: 24. 1 Cor. 9: 4, 18. 2 Thess. 3: 9. In perfect accordance with this import, is the classic usage of the word ἐξουσία, as signifying "licentia, potestas, auctoritas, jus sive facultas *moralis*; at δυνάμις vis activa, seu facultas *naturalis*;" licence, power, authority, a moral right; whilst δυνάμις signifies a physical or natural faculty or power.

To this doctrine of the ubiquity of the body of Christ, numerous and formidable objections present themselves.

1. The idea that the properties of one substance can become the properties of a different substance, is a philosophical absurdity.

2. It is impossible, in the nature of things, that the infinite properties of God, the uncreated one, should be communicated to any creature. The difference between the creature and the Creator is an infinite and unchangeable one. Yet, if the hu-

man nature of Christ acquired possession of divine attributes, it must itself be divine.

3. Wherever any one divine attribute is found, there the others must also be, and that is God. If then the body of Christ, or his humanity in general, possesses one divine attribute, it must possess them all and must be God. Yes the finite has become infinite, the creature has become the Creator, and a feeble mortal like unto us in all things, sin only excepted, has become the immortal God!

A distinction has been made between mediate and immediate communication, and it has been affirmed the attributes of Deity have been communicated to the man Jesus only mediately. But mediate communication in reference to this subject is no communication at all, and can only signify, that the divine nature of Christ is at all times ready to exert his divine attributes for the accomplishment of the purposes of the associated humanity, and this no one denies, but this cannot with propriety of language be styled communication of attributes.

4. If the hypostatic union in Christ implies a communication of attributes, it must be reciprocal, and whilst the humanity of Christ is clothed in the attributes of divinity, his divinity must also have assumed the attributes of humanity: have become human; which the opponents are unwilling to admit.

5. If this hypostatic union is attended by a transfer of attributes, it necessarily involves a confusion of natures, which error was condemned by the ancient church in the Eutychians. And if it was such as to preserve the attributes of each nature distinct, then there can be no real transfer of attributes.

6. The doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's body instead of conferring more importance on the Eucharist, actually robs it of all special interest, and gives no more to the sacrament than to every other object and place. We may upon this theory, as well say that Christ's body is in, with or under, every apple and pear, peach and cake, as in the consecrated bread.

7. Nay this doctrine is not entirely exempt from liability to the charge of favoring *pantheism*. If Christ's *body* is omnipresent, we are in him and he in us, whether believers or unbelievers we are one: especially as all bodies must have extension, and occupy space, and exclude other bodies. The idea also that Christ's *body* nourishes our *souls* has a similar tendency, by leading to the supposition that soul and body are ultimately identical, or of the same substance.

8. If the glorified body of Christ is really in, with, or under the bread, it will be very proper to direct our worship towards

the bread, and thus adore the present God-man who is somehow connected with it. For we know that his divine nature is there, as it is omnipresent: and therefore we would have as much reason to worship towards the bread as if he were personally and visibly to appear in connexion with it.

9. It will be admitted that the union of the two natures in Christ, was just as real and intimate during his life on earth as it ever will be; (for it is decided by the Form of Concord, to have commenced at the moment of his conception by the virgin Mary). Now as this union produced not even the shadow of a *communicatio idiomatum* (transfer or communication of attributes) on earth, it is not probable that it will hereafter. It certainly proves, that such communication is not the natural result of the hypostatic union in Christ, and therefore it cannot be true, unless the Scriptures expressly teach that this union will produce very different results in eternity from those which attend it in this world, which is not contended.

Finally, the discourse of our Lord to his disciples at Capernaum, recorded in John 6: 25-55. has sometimes, though contrary to the example of Luther and the other principal reformers, been supposed to refer to the holy supper, and to teach the literal manducation of the Saviour's body and the drinking of his blood. It is true our Saviour here employs the language, "I am the bread of life," as he elsewhere does the expression, "I am the vine," and "I am the light of the world," &c. John 8: 12. Again, the Saviour also says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," &c. v. 54. That these and similar expressions in this discourse, can have no reference to the Lord's Supper, is evident from the fact, that no such ordinance as the eucharist then existed, or had been heard of. This discourse according to the most probable chronological arrangement of the evangelical narrative, was delivered about a year before the Saviour instituted it, and before his disciples could possibly have had the least idea of such intended memorial. Of course they could not understand these words, as referring to an ordinance of which they had never heard, and to the future institution of which there was not a single allusion in the discourse itself.

Again, that the Saviour in this entire discourse had reference to his being the food of believers, is abundantly evident from the phraseology employed. 1) In v. 35. to the words, "I am the bread of life," he immediately adds by way of explanation, "he that cometh to me, shall never hunger, he that believeth on me shall never thirst," showing that it is by *faith*,

that he becomes the bread of life to us. 2) v. 40. "He that *believeth* on the Son, hath everlasting life," showing the necessity of *faith* to the enjoyment of this spiritual food. Also, 3) v. 47. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that *believeth* on me hath everlasting life — I am that *bread* of life." 4) v. 51. "The bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world," i. e. which flesh I will give, not to *believers* to be eaten; but *for* them on the cross; and not for *believers only*, who receive the holy supper, but for the "*world*," many who reject my atonement and never celebrate the supper, which I shall institute in commemoration of my death. If sacramental eating were intended, it must have been limited to his professed followers, who celebrate the ordinance; and could not have been extended to the world at large who neglect it. 5) v. 56. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him." If this passage teaches a *physical* eating and indwelling of the Saviour's body in the communicant, it also affirms that the communicant's body dwells in the body of the Saviour, which is absurd. 6) v. 63. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life." Here the Saviour seems, in the closing words of this discourse, expressly to teach that the *literal* eating of his flesh would profit them nothing; that it is the Spirit that quickeneth, and that his words are spirit, are to be *spiritually* and not literally understood. This interpretation is moreover confirmed by the succeeding remark of Christ: 7) v. 64. "But there are some of you that *believe* not," some who have no faith, and therefore cannot thus spiritually feed on my flesh and blood. From all these considerations, we cannot but coincide with the judgment of Luther and the most distinguished divines of ancient and modern days, as expressed by the learned Lutheran theologian Gerhard: "*The passage, John 6: 53. does not treat of sacramental but of spiritual eating the body and drinking the blood of Christ, which is essential to salvation for all.*"¹

§ 4. The second tropical Interpretation (by Calvin).

The *third* interpretation of these words is that of *Calvin*, which though generally abandoned by his followers in Europe and America, is deserving of a passing notice. That distin-

¹ Dictum John VI. 53. non de sacramentali sed spirituali corporis et sanguinis Christi manducatione et bibitione tractat, quæ omnibus ad salutem necessaria est. Loci Theol. de Sacra Cæna.

guished Reformer, animated by a noble desire to prevent a schism in the Protestant church of Europe, though he could not adopt the view of Luther on this subject, labored hard to come as near it as possible, without making himself liable to the grosser objections which lie against the Lutheran dogma. He supposed the words of the institution to teach, not that the body and blood of Christ are present at the celebration of the eucharist; but that they remain in heaven, and from these a supernatural influence emanates from the glorified body of Christ, by which the soul of the believer is animated and strengthened in a mysterious manner.

This interpretation is indeed free from the charge of conflicting with the testimony of the senses; but it seems so entirely different from either the literal or the figurative import of the Saviour's words, as to bear evident marks of having grown out of extraneous theological considerations.

Calvin's own language on this subject is: "I therefore maintain, that in the *mystery* of the supper, by the emblems of bread and wine, Christ is *really exhibited* to us; that is, his body and blood, in which he yielded full obedience in order to work out a righteousness for us; by which in the first place, we may as it were become united with him into one body; and secondly, being made partakers of the *substance* of himself, also be strengthened by the reception of every blessing."¹ The entire opinion of Calvin is thus stated by Dr. Bretschneider, a very distinguished late writer of Germany: "Calvin's spiritual reception of the body and blood of Christ, is indeed a real but not an oral one, and consists in this, that in the moment in which we partake of the bread and wine, if our hearts are by faith elevated to him, a *supernatural* influence emanates from the substance of the glorified body of Christ (which is in heaven and remains there), by which the soul of the believer is animated and strengthened in a *mysterious* manner. But the unbeliever receives nothing more than bread and wine."²

It may perhaps be regarded as a striking coincidence, that the views of the two most illustrious reformers on this subject have been almost universally abandoned by their followers;

¹ Dico igitur in coenæ mysterio per symbola panis et vini Christum vere nobis exhiberi, adeoque corpus et sanguinem ejus, in quibus omnem obedientiam pro comparanda nobis justitia adimplevit; quo scilicet primum in unum corpus cum ipso coalescamus; deinde participes substantiæ ejus facti, in bonorum omnium communicatione virtutem quoque sentiamus. Institut. Lib. IV. Cap. XVII. II.

² Dr. Bretschneider's Systematische Entwicklung aller in der Dogmatik vorkommender Begriffe, p. 721. ed. 3. 1826.

even whilst they adhere to nearly all the other features of their doctrinal system. Yea, the view of Calvin, though the subject of much less controversy, has been more universally rejected by those who bear his name, than has the view of Luther by his followers.

§ 5. *The true, Historical and Pauline interpretation of the words of the Institution.*

We come now, in the last place, to attempt an unbiassed, impartial examination of the words of the institution, according to the fair principles of historical interpretation, as laid down in our introductory observations.

Was there any thing peculiar in the occasion and the circumstances, attending the utterance of these words, calculated to illustrate their meaning?

The Saviour and his disciples had just celebrated the Passover, an institution appointed of God to commemorate an important event of the Old Testament history, at which it was not unusual to use language similar to that of our Saviour. At its institution, though it was expressly appointed to *commemorate* the passing of the angel of the Lord over the Israelites in Egypt, whilst he destroyed the first born of the Egyptians; yet Moses uses language similar to that of the Saviour: "Ye shall eat it in haste, for it is the Lord's passing over," i. e. it *signifies* the angel of the Lord's passing over the house of the Israelites, &c. Exod. 12: 26, 27. No one imagines these words to mean: "The lamb that was slain at the passover, was the passing over of the Lord's angel." All admit that "is" here is equivalent to *signifies*.

This ordinance, whilst it commemorated the divine favor to the Israelites in Egypt, also, as Paul tells us, was typical of the Saviour himself.

Now it was at the close of this mnemonic or commemorative and symbolic pascal supper, where symbolic ideas prevailed, and figurative language is usual among the Jews,¹ even to this day, that the Saviour uttered the words under consideration.

1. After the pascal supper, "Jesus took bread." It was *natural* bread, not miraculously furnished. He took the bread, which happened to be prepared for the passover, and which, according to Jewish law, must be unleavened bread. Yet it is equally certain, from the New Testament, as the primitive

¹ See Levi's Forms of Prayer for Passover and Pentecost, among the Spanish and Portuguese Jews, p. 20.

christians received the Lord's supper every week, and often more frequently, that on some occasions they used leavened bread, as no other was at hand.

2. Jesus "offered a prayer." Mark, and perhaps Matthew, use the term *εὐλογῆσας*, which signifies "to bless," or pronounce a *blessing*. But neither of them says, that he blessed "*it*" (*τὸ*), as our English version has it. Very good manuscripts read *εὐχαριστήσας* "having given thanks," in Matthew. Luke and Paul both say, "he gave thanks," *εὐχαριστήσας*. There is not a syllable about his effecting any *change* in the bread, as Romanists pretend, nor of his making those elements the conductors or means of imparting his body to us. In short, according to the original, he did not specifically bless the bread or wine, nor do any thing at all to them. He offered thanks, as it was also customary to do at the beginning of the paschal supper, and as is in itself always appropriate, and invoked the blessing of his heavenly Father upon the whole ceremony, of course also including the elements employed.

3. No change had been effected in the bread. It was still natural bread, as the Saviour broke it; which he would not have done, if his prayer had transubstantiated it into his own body, or in any way made it the vehicle of his material body. It was still natural bread, because the disciples exhibited no evidence of having the least idea, that they received any thing but bread.

4. "He gave it to them and said, *Take, eat, this is my body.*" *λάβετε, φάγετε, τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα μου.*

That the literal interpretation of these words by the Romanists, as well as several others, which, though professedly literal, are really figurative and inconsistent with the context, cannot be sustained, we have endeavored to show in a former part of this discussion. What, then, is their true interpretation? Let us, if possible, derive our guide for the true meaning of these words, from the declarations of the Saviour himself, and of his apostles.

1) Let us inquire, Does the *breaking* of the bread throw any light upon our investigation?

It must have been done by the Saviour, so far as we can judge, from one of two reasons; either because the cake, or loaf of bread, was too large to be conveniently handed around, or because the Lord intended it to possess some significance, either symbolic or other, connected with the design of the whole institution. It seems not to have been the former, because the bread was then, as is still customary among the Arabians, baked in cakes of moderate thickness, easily baked

through, and convenient for breaking. (See 'Leidensgeschichte Jesu,' p. 45.) But that he had another and important design in breaking the bread or cake, is evident from the fact, that the Saviour expressly states, that this *broken* bread is, or represents his "*body broken*," that is, represents the *breaking* of his body, his crucifixion, or death upon the cross. Here then we have the infallible declaration of the Lord himself, that the *broken* bread in the eucharist, represents the breaking or crucifixion of his body. To represent this fact, the breaking of the bread was very appropriate; but to designate the future *presence* of his glorified body, it would have no significance or appropriateness at all. The *broken* bread must be a representative of the *dead*, the *crucified* body, and cannot in any way, be designed to indicate the presence of the living body either glorified or not. The accuracy of this interpretation is confirmed by the fact of the Saviour's also mentioning that the wine signified not only his blood, which would have been sufficient, if the mere presence of the Lord was to be indicated; but his blood "*shed*," the *shedding* of his blood on the cross. Should it be said, if the breaking of the bread was significant, then also something should have been done to the wine, to indicate its being shed; we reply: This was not necessary. The fact that his body was broken, already indicates that his blood was shed. Besides, the representation of the blood, as separated from the body, also implies the same fact.

2. This is or represents *my body* "*given*," says Luke, and "*broken*," says Paul, "*for you*." That by these terms, "*given*" and "*broken*," the crucifixion of the Lord is indicated, cannot be denied, and we believe is not. But if the Lord himself teaches us, that to represent his death upon the cross, is the object of the Holy Supper; then we are certain of being correct in supposing and teaching this truth; and if others suppose this ordinance was instituted for a *double* purpose, it devolves on them to exhibit proof of the *other*, in the same way as this is established, by declarations of Christ or his apostles. Here the *onus probandi* most justly lies on them, and if they fail to prove a *second* object, then this remains the only one, namely, to represent in all coming time that all important, amazing fact, which "*angels desire to look into*," the death of the Son of God upon the cross, an event which happened about eighteen hundred years ago. As the Holy Supper was certainly instituted to commemorate this eternally important occurrence, an event sufficiently momentous to justify the institution of a standing rite for its commemoration, it is not probable *a priori*, that another very different object (the pre-

sence of the living, glorified Lord) would be joined to it; and as we find no clear indication of the fact in Scripture, we are compelled to doubt it.

If the Saviour's object had been to represent the *presence* of his body in the eucharist, the bread entire would have been more suitable, and if, in that event, he had even broken the paschal cake or bread merely incidentally, there would have been no object in his stating the fact. But he himself informs us, it signifies his body "*broken*," the breaking of his body, his crucifixion, his death upon the cross. The same remarks are equally applicable to the language of the Saviour in reference to the wine. "Take and drink, this is my blood," and as Paul and Luke says, "this cup is the New Covenant in my blood *'which is shed'* for you — for many, for the remission of sins." The wine therefore most undoubtedly commemorates the *shedding* of the Saviour's blood on the cross.

3. "*Do this in remembrance of me*," says the Saviour, according to Luke and Paul. Luke has *τατο ποιετε εις την μνην ανανησθαι*, do this in *remembrance* or in commemoration of me; Paul has the same words, only adding, *ουακις αν πινητε*, *Do this, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance or commemoration of me*. Now the very fact that we are called on to do any thing in remembrance of any person or event, implies two things. *First*, it presupposes the priority or antecedence of the event, it implies that the event is *past*. Even when we commemorate any actions of a living person, those actions must be past. The very import of the word remember, necessarily implies that the thing to be remembered is a something past. *Again*, the term "*remembrance*" implies the *absence* of the person or thing to be remembered. When our friend is with us, we do not need any rite or ceremony to remind us of the fact. Nor can we, in propriety of language, be said to "*remember*" a *present* object or friend. The very necessity of such a rite, if our friend were with us, would convey a reflection on our attachment to him. It is, when about to separate, that friends bestow on each other mementos; or agree on the stated performance of some act to keep alive the remembrance of each other during their separation. Now, both these implications of the Saviour's words, "*Do this in remembrance of me*," accord perfectly with the object of the eucharist as explained by himself. At the celebration of this standing rite of the church, in commemoration of the breaking or crucifixion of his body, the fact would be past and his body would be absent. The glorious fact of his atoning death on the cross, would from

century to century be receding farther and farther into the past, and as objects are in danger of being forgotten in proportion as they recede farther from us, nothing could be more appropriate than the institution of an ordinance, to keep alive in the forgetful memory of his disciples, that fundamental fact in the history of redemption, which is the ground of every believer's hope, and on which the salvation of a world is suspended.

But, if the design of the eucharist is a twofold one; if in addition to the commemoration of the crucifixion of the son of God, that ordinance was, as some suppose, also appointed for the purpose of commemorating the Saviour's presence with us, and the communication of his body to the communicant, the language "*in remembrance of me,*" appears not only strange, but inappropriate. It would have been more natural for him to say: "As often as ye eat this bread and drink of this cup, ye do celebrate my *return* to your midst."

The Pauline Interpretation of the Saviour's Words.

Such are the intimations concerning the design of this solemn ordinance, furnished by the words of the Saviour himself. If we had no other, they would incontestably establish the fact, that it is a *mnemonic* rite, instituted to *commemorate* the death of Christ on the cross. But we have still another inspired narrative of this institution, from the distinguished Apostle of the Gentiles, twenty-four years after the establishment of this ordinance, and the Ascension of the Saviour to heaven, 1 Cor. 11: 23-30. And what did Paul regard as the design of this holy feast of love?

1) He also declares the bread to stand related to the *broken* body, to signify the *breaking* of Christ's body, as above intimated. "The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he *brake* it and said, Take, eat, this is my body which is (or is to be) *broken for you.*"

2) He expressly pronounces the design of this rite to be *mnemonic*, "this do in *remembrance* of me," the force of which words we have above illustrated, as equivalent to "Do this in order to keep alive the recollection of a *past* event and of an *absent* person."

3) But he adds two other important indications, which are not contained in the gospels. "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup (the wine in it), τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε "ye do show forth, or publish, *the death* of the Lord." Here then we have the plain, literal declaration of the

inspired Paul, as clear as language can make it, that the result of the Holy Supper is to commemorate, not the Lord's presence, nor his bestowing his body and blood on the communicants, but to *show forth the Lord's death*, that amazing display of divine love on the cross, which is the foundation fact, the central doctrine of Christianity, and the recollection and full appreciation of which, is essential to the christian character. This declaration of the Apostle is of incalculable value. The greater portion of the language of Christ is or may be figurative, and therefore admits of a diversity of interpretations, and it may remain questionable which is their true sense. But this language of Paul is literal, nothing figurative about it, and therefore in its import all agree. All admit that he designs to say, as often as ye celebrate this holy supper, ye commemorate, perpetuate the memory of, revive your recollection of the death of Jesus on the cross.

It is certain, then, that this was the object of the Saviour in this sacred institution. It is certain also that, in the view of Paul, this was its great and principal design, if not its only one. And it is probable, that he regarded it as the only one, since he mentions no other. The expressions from which some would deduce another design, "are not the bread and wine *the communion* of the body and blood of Christ," have been explained above, we think, satisfactorily. They teach that the bread and wine bring us into solemn, spiritual, mental communion, or recollection of and reflection on the Saviour's body and blood, broken and shed for us on the cross.

4) But this illustrious apostle adds another expression calculated to reflect light on this subject. He adds, "Ye do show forth the Lord's death" ἀπαρίσσετε τὸ θάνατον, "*until he come.*" This solemn declaration clearly teaches three facts; *first*, that the Lord is himself absent at the celebration of the supper, as well as generally after his ascension; and *secondly*, that he will continue absent personally, as long as the supper is to be commemorated; and *thirdly*, when he comes, his personal presence will supercede the necessity of any further observance of a commemorative ordinance.

About twenty-four years had elapsed since Jesus had ascended to heaven. In the mean time he had been seen by no one of all his friends or enemies on earth. Whether he had appeared unto Paul, fourteen years before this time, when wrapped in holy vision, he was elevated to the third heavens, Paul does not state: yet it is highly probable. Once he had certainly seen him, during his journey to Damascus. But then he appeared to him in the clouds of heaven evidently

from another world. At other times he received special communications from him, but it is not certain that he again appeared to him personally. All the experience of the Apostle therefore, had connected the present residence or local existence and manifestation of the Saviour with another world, and taught him that Christ was absent.

These words of Paul also imply, that so long as it is obligatory on Christians to celebrate this holy feast, the Saviour will continue absent; for they are commanded to repeat its celebration often, *until* he comes; which involves the consequence that when he does come, this celebration shall cease. And finally as this celebration, or commemoration of the Saviour's death, is to cease on his personal return to earth, it seems a natural supposition, that it was appointed to preserve in constant memory something which in his absence we would be prone to forget: and Paul tells us, this was the grand and cardinal fact in his mediatorial career, his vicarious death upon the cross for the sins of the world.

Since it is certain that the commemoration of the Lord's death is the object of the sacramental institution, the question arises, whether there is any reason to suppose, that the Lord had a double object in view. The only arguments in support of such a supposition are found in the supposed necessity of a literal interpretation of the phrase *τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα μου*, "this is my body," and the phrase of Paul, 1 Cor. 10: 16. *ὄχι (τὸ ποτήριον) κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστὶ*; "is it not (the cup) the communion of the blood of Christ?" &c. *καὶ τὸν ἄρτον, ὄχι κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστὶ*; and "the bread, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" But as we have already proved, that the literal interpretation of the Romanists is utterly untenable; and that the doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ "*in, with, or under*" the elements, is not a literal one, but figurative and unnatural, and at the same time, liable to many of the objections, on account of which all Protestants repudiate the Romish literal interpretation, we need not repeat them. And having already presented our view of the import of the term *κοινωνία*, "communion," in the Epistle to the Corinthians, the only thing which remains, in order to vindicate the Pauline interpretation, which we adopt as our own, namely the *mnemonic* import of the rite, its appointment to perpetuate the memory of the Lord's death or crucifixion, is to show that this figurative or tropical interpretation of the phrase *τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα μου*, "this is my body," is perfectly sustained by the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament.

a) Even those who receive the doctrine of the real presence, concede that these words do admit of the figurative meaning for which we contend. The learned and pious Dr. Storr remarks: "The words of our Lord, 'This is my body' &c. may indeed be explained figuratively without violence to the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament. The figure assumed would not be an uncommon one. Nor can it be said that the nature of the case altogether forbids the supposition of the language being figurative. For it cannot be denied that some of the language used in the institution of the Holy Supper is figurative (tropical)."¹ Nor is this admission made without cause. The reasons sustaining this opinion are numerous and most satisfactory.

b) The Hebrew language does not contain a word to express the idea, *signify*, and therefore the Hebrews always conveyed that idea by other terms, usually by the substantive verb, *היה*, to be. Or perhaps more frequently the phrase is elliptical, and the verb entirely wanting, and to be supplied from the context. But the inspired evangelists have given us the verb *ישר*, "is"; and it is the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament in regard to this term that we are to investigate.

c) That this method of using the term "is" for "signifies," is a very common one among different nations, is well known and the idiom of the Old and New Testament is in this respect the same. Thus it was customary for the Jews when interrogated by their children concerning the import of the Passover, to reply: "This is the body of the Lamb which our fathers ate in Egypt," that is, it *signifies* the lamb, &c. The Psalmist says, (Ps. 18: 2.): The Lord *is* my rock and my fortress — *is* my buckler, — *is* the horn of my salvation, — *is* my high tower. Ps. 23: 1. The Lord *is* my shepherd, &c. &c.

But the Scriptures abound in cases of the very same figure, which we are now considering. Gen. 40: 12. Joseph says, "the three branches *are* three days, i. e. *signify* three days. 41: 26. The seven good kine *are* seven years. Danl. 7: 24. "The ten horns out of this kingdom *are* ten kings that shall rise." v. 17. "These great beasts which are four, *are* four kings." 8: 21. "And the rough goat *is* the king of Greece." In all the above cases, though the language is elliptical, the substantive verb is understood, which is expressed in our English Bible. Paul says, (1 Cor. 10: 4.) "That rock (that followed the Israelites in the wilderness) *was* (*ἦν*) Christ." Gal. 4: 24. "For these (Sarah and Hagar) *are* (*εἰσι*) the two cov-

¹ Storr's Biblical Theology, § 114. III. 6. p. 537 of 2d ed. of the translation.

enants," i. e. signify them. Luke 12: 1. "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees *τῆς ἰστοῦ* which is (signifies) hypocrisy." Heb. 7: 2. "King of Salem, *ὁ εἰς*, that is (signifies) king of peace." Mark 4: 15. And these *are* they by the wayside — and on stony ground, — among thorns, &c., that is, these *represent* or signify them. 2 Peter 2: 17. These (the false prophets) *are*, that is, *signify*, without water.

But did the Saviour himself employ such figurative language, in reference to himself, on any other occasion than at the sacramental supper? *He doubtless did on various occasions.* John 5: 11, 14. I am the good shepherd. 6: 35, 41, 48, 51. I am the bread of life, *ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἀπὸς*. 8: 12. I am the light of the world, *ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου*. 10: 7, 9. I am (*ἐγὼ εἰμι*) the door of the sheep — "I am the door" 14: 6. I am the way, the truth and the life. 15: 1, 2. I am the vine, ye are the branches. I am the resurrection and the life — I am the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. Here then we perceive that the Saviour was in the habit of speaking of himself in this tropical manner, calling himself bread, a shepherd, a door. That he should also compare his body to bread and his blood to wine, is therefore perfectly accordant with his habits; and the figurative use of the phrase "this is," *τοῦτ' ἐστίν*, is perfectly accordant with the *usus loquendi*, and therefore we are at perfect liberty, according to the sound principles of interpretation, to give to these words, "*this is my body*," "*this is my blood*," the meaning, *signifies* my body, *signifies* my blood, as required by the design of the ordinance as taught by Paul and by the Saviour himself, namely to show forth the Lord's death until he come.

In view of all these facts, it seems evident that the words of the sacramental institution as uttered by the Saviour, recorded by the evangelists and explained by Paul, are to be understood, so far as the mode of the Saviour's presence is concerned, as follows:

"And as they were eating (the paschal supper), Jesus took bread (the unleavened bread or cake which had been prepared for the passover), and having given thanks and pronounced a blessing, he gave the pieces of bread to his disciples, and said, Take, eat, this (bread, which is and remains bread and) signifies my (natural, not glorified) body, which is (to be) broken for you (on the cross, crucified), do this in (order to cherish the) remembrance of me. Likewise he took the cup, after (the paschal) supper (was ended), and when he had given thanks he gave it to them saying, Drink ye all of it (of the wine which was ordinary wine that had been prepared for the

Passover): This cup (the wine in it) is (signifies or represents) the new testament in my blood (represents the new covenant ratified by my blood), which is (to be) shed (on the cross) for you and for many for the remission of sins. This do ye as often as ye drink it, in (order to cherish the) remembrance of me. For as often as ye (reverently and devoutly) eat this bread and drink the wine in this cup (consecrated by prayer for the sacramental celebration) ye do show forth (perpetuate the memory of) the Lord's death (upon the cross) until he returns (at the latter day, at the close of the present dispensation). Whoever shall eat this bread and drink this wine unworthily (irreverently and without faith and a due regard for the solemn design for which they were appointed,) is guilty (in respect to the) body and blood of the Lord (guilty of treating irreverently or profanely the emblems or memorials of the Saviour's broken body and shed blood and thus guilty of casting reproach on the Lord himself). Let a man therefore examine himself (as to his knowledge of the design of the institution and his moral qualifications to receive it); for he that eateth or drinketh unworthily (in an irreverent manner and without faith in Christ), eateth and drinketh (judgment, *κριμα*, not) damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body (not distinguishing between ordinary bread and these elements, instituted and consecrated as emblems of the Saviour's crucified body and blood).

According to this view of the sacramental narrative, it follows, that in the Holy Supper of our Lord, there is

1. A *real* presence of the Saviour as to his *divine* nature.
2. A *spiritual*, that is, symbolic presence as to his *human* nature, and
3. An *influential* presence, as to the blessings flowing from his death and mediatorial work in general, from his work as God-man (*θεοανθρωπος*).

Hence, the view of the Lord's Supper, which is most Scriptural, and also most generally received by the great majority of the Lutheran ministry and churches in this country, is summarily the following:

That there is no real or actual presence of the glorified human nature of the Saviour either substantial or influential, nor any thing mysterious or supernatural in the eucharist; yet, that whilst the bread and wine are merely symbolic representations of the Saviour's absent body, by which we are reminded of his sufferings, there is also a PECULIAR and special SPIRITUAL blessing bestowed by the divine Saviour on all worthy communicants, by which their faith and Christian

*graces are confirmed.*¹ The further development of the nature and evidences of the various blessings resulting from this ordinance, does not fall within the design of the present discussion. Having thus presented the view of the Saviour's presence in the Holy Supper, which we find clearly taught in the records of inspiration, we close with the remark, that whilst we vindicate to ourselves the right to believe and profess what we regard as the Scriptural view of this subject, we consider the Protestant diversities in reference to it as of minor moment, and can cordially fraternize with the Zwinglian and all others on the one hand, who attribute to this ordinance no *peculiar* spiritual blessing, beyond that of the other means of grace, and with the rigid adherent of Luther's view on the other, who believes in the real presence, the eating and drinking of the body and blood of the Redeemer in this Holy Feast of Love.

ARTICLE III.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE OF FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES.

By Rev. Charles F. Schaeffer D. D., Easton, Pa.

THE intellectual activity of the present age in every department of science frequently leads to the investigation of the truth of principles which had, at an earlier period, been supposed to be incontrovertibly established; while, too, the progress of discovery has introduced many new technical terms, it has discarded some as unsuited to the present advanced state of science, and assigned new definitions to others that have been retained. In the departments of human knowledge not occupied by the exact sciences, many inconveniences are still occasioned by the use of terms, the sense of which is not positively fixed or distinctly apprehended. Of this fact various religious terms, that are now frequently employed in the discussion of doctrinal and ethical questions, afford illustrations. When teachers or disputants have exerted all their powers in unfolding and establishing their views, the result of their labors is, sometimes, the unwelcome discovery that their meaning has

¹ Popular Theology, p. 303, 5th ed.

been entirely misapprehended. They have not enlightened but clouded the minds of those whom they addressed, and, in place of convincing others, are themselves charged with self-contradiction or error; while they sincerely attempt to promote among believers the cause of Christian union, they perceive, with unspeakable grief, that they have, involuntarily, become the authors of discord, and have occasioned new alienation of spirit. To avoid these painful consequences, no remedy is more efficacious in certain cases, than a distinct expression of the sense in which a theological term is used, particularly, if after an honest investigation of first principles, that sense may be expected to be recognized as just and true. Until this course be generally adopted, all efforts to effect that union of believers which we yet hope to be accomplished, but which has hitherto found so many obstacles in the prejudices of men, will continue to result in mortifying defeats.

Amid the disappointments which we encounter in this noble cause of Christian Union, we are often soothed and cheered by the kind language which dissentient brethren employ.—The polemic cry is sometimes hushed, the controversial pano-
ply is laid aside, the sectarian scowl is relaxed, the Bible, which had become grievously contorted in all its parts, during the contest, is partially restored to its former position, and the wearied combatants salute each other, not simply as allies, but as brethren. Why should they longer contend? Do they not agree in "fundamentals"? The angel of peace seems to descend and to illumine a scene not now disfigured by wrath and bleeding wounds, but hallowed by the sweet influences of brotherly confidence and christian love. Why can they not "agree to differ"? "Do we not," the delightful chorus repeats, "do we not fully accord in essentials?" Charmed by this unexpected issue of the struggle, we indulge in the most pleasing anticipations; we apprehend no renewal of the contest; we bear with us a talisman, which, wherever it is applied, will surely banish the demon of discord; let us merely pronounce the mystic words: *We agree in fundamentals*,—and harmony is secured. Alas! it is a dream. We return to actual life; we approach those whose names indicate a difference of theological views, and we discover that these shadowy "fundamentals" existed only in our night-visions. When we inquire into their nature, we find that, practically, each religious opinion is assumed to be fundamental. We propose a union, we suggest that certain views may be safely permitted to recede, and we entreat those whom we address, to confine themselves

to "fundamental doctrines," assuring them that therein all the orthodox agree. To our dismay, the contest recommences; the definition of the word provokes jealousy and prejudice; we ultimately arrive at the conclusion, that nothing is explained, nothing gained, not a step to an actual union taken, until we all adopt the same views of the nature and power of "fundamental truths;" then, and not till then, we can agree, and calmly permit minor differences of opinion to remain without an advocate.

What are "fundamental doctrines," or "fundamental Articles of faith"?¹ The answer is, confessedly, attended with serious difficulties. Every intelligent Christian feels competent to state the general basis of his belief, or the doctrinal foundation of his Christian character and life, and may even wonder that a question apparently so simple is proposed. When he, however, proceeds to *specify in detail* the doctrines which essentially constitute that "foundation," he will no longer be surprised by the embarrassment that even distinguished divines, on attempting to furnish an answer, have candidly confessed. The difficulties attending the solution of the problem proceed from various sources:—the vagueness attached to the term "fundamental doctrines" itself, in consequence of its figurative character, which unfits it for scientific purposes—its singular complexity or involvedness and tensibility, which seem to defy analysis—the absence of a scriptural or authoritative definition, combined with the uncertain exegesis of the texts which have apparently suggested it—the undetermined nature of the *superstructure* erected on these "fundamental doctrines." The fluctuations of the meaning of the term appear in every discussion which occasions a recurrence to the great landmarks of the Christian faith. When the doctrine of the Atonement of Christ, for instance, is denied, we refer, perhaps, to passages

¹ This expression originated in the 17th century, when certain efforts were made either to re-unite Lutherans, Reformed and Roman Catholics into one ecclesiastical society, or to secure a virtual union, by the recession of doctrines that were diametrically opposed to each other, and the adoption of the meagre confessions of the earlier centuries. The eminent Calixtus, to whose movements the term *Syncretism* was applied, was, unfortunately, led by his zeal in the work of accomplishing a great and noble design, as it appeared to him, to assume the position that "the Lutherans and Roman Catholics did not differ about the *fundamental doctrines* of the Christian faith," as his candid apologist Mosheim (Church Hist. Cent. 17. Sect. II. Part II. Ch. I. § 23. note f.) admits, while he regrets the circumstance. It was in reference to such preposterous attempts at union that our admirable "Church Father," Nicholas Hunnius, published in Wittenberg in 1626 his celebrated *Διασκέψις theol. de fundamentali dissensu doctr. ev. &c.* consisting of 632 pages, without the index. This work, which is scarce, and to which we have not access, introduced or gave currency to the term "fundamental articles."

like 1 Cor. 3: 11. or Matth. 16: 16., without precisely defining whether such a text specially regards the divinity, or the person, or the work of Christ, we have a general impression that the "doctrine concerning Christ" is *the* fundamental doctrine. But the opponent may be a Trinitarian Universalist, such as we personally know, and appear to deviate from our system specially in reference to the doctrine to which he owes his name.¹ At once we expand the definition of the term, and it now embraces an eschatological doctrine far removed from the soterological or christological portion of the system to which the doctrine concerning Christ belongs. When the Papist adores the *Host*, he adapts flour to one of many miscellaneous uses, precisely as the idolater so graphically described by Isaiah, ch. 44: 9-20. applies a forest tree. "He burneth part thereof in the fire; with part thereof he eateth flesh; . . . and the residue thereof he maketh a god." One part of the precious wheat which God had given, he employs for food, another, he converts into a god. We instinctively feel, as we look with scorn and abhorrence on this heathenish worship which a *Christian*, as the Papist terms himself, renders to the Son of God as he alleges, that this idolater, with all his professed implicit² faith, which fully admits the divinity of Christ, differs fundamentally in doctrine from ourselves. Do *fundamentals* concern not only the essential differences of doctrines among Protestants, but also those in which "Catholicity"³ deviated from Protestantism? Can we *now* proceed to designate *fundamental* doctrines with precision? An affirmative answer would, perhaps, afford a tangible result, but it is given with great hesitation; for, surely, the Mufti, the Brahmin and the Fetichist differ fundamentally from us as well as a Rabbi or a Pope.

¹ In the 17th Cent., the Arminians and others, who held their views on the subject of the divine decrees, were termed either absolute and categorical or hypothetical *Universalists*; the former regarded the grace of God as offered absolutely and universally, the latter imposed certain restrictions upon it. Both were distinguished from the *Particularists* (Calvinists and Jansenists). The *Arminians* of our day, probably disown the name of *Universalists*, in its more recent sense, as applied to a sickly sect. These appellations were bandied in the French and Dutch or Holland Reformed churches, but, we believe, were never either adopted or indeed needed by the Lutheran church.

² "Fides implicita seu informis, i. e. assensus, qui omnia, quamvis ignota, quæ ab Ecclesia probantur, amplectitur."

³ This favorite term of papistical writers is as amusing as the

* * * * *
"molossici,
Odiosicque et multum incommodistici,"

of Ergasilus, Plaut. Capt. I, 1. 18.

This vagueness of signification does not occur solely in religious discussions. We quote an illustrative passage from an eminent writer, who is not advocating any system of faith, but speaking historically of a past age; and we introduce it rather than any other passage, because it chances to be the last and the most accessible in which we remember that we have found the term. "The greatest and most popular dramatists of the Elizabethan age treat religious subjects in a very remarkable manner. They speak respectfully of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. But they speak neither like Catholics nor like Protestants, but like persons who are wavering between the two systems; or who have made a system for themselves out of parts selected from both. They seem to hold some of the Romish rites and doctrines in high respect. They treat the vow of celibacy, for example, so tempting, and, in after times, so common a subject for ribaldry, with mysterious reverence," &c. (Review of Nares' *Memoirs of Lord Burghley*, *Edinburg Review*, 1832—p. 123, Vol. 2 of Carey and Hart's edition of Macaulay's *Essays*.) Macaulay has certainly not weighed the expression with his usual accuracy. Are the "fundamental doctrines of Christianity" so few in number, so exceedingly abstract, so indefinite, that a writer can refer at all to them without betraying popish errors, or revealing the splendor of principles that are Protestant in the lofty sense of the name?¹ The existence of a God, the death of the theanthropic Redeemer, the personality of the Spirit—are such doctrines alone fundamental? The term is so evanescent that, when we think we have secured the meaning, Proteus himself does not more successfully elude our grasp. It occurs absolutely in a gaseous state in Dumesnil's fanciful work "*De l'Esprit des Religions*," the *Discours Préliminaire* prefixed to

¹ We entirely disavow that sense of the term *fundamentals*, in which some writers have proposed to employ it, viz. that each distinct religious denomination may have its own fundamental doctrines by which it is essentially distinguished from the rest. We recognize only one Lord, one faith, *one Church*, according to the Scriptures. To speak of the fundamental doctrines, respectively, of Christianity and of Mohammedism, is really to degrade the former to the level of a false religion; the two cannot be compared on equal terms; the former alone is true—the latter is only one of a thousand forms of error, combined, at best, with some rays of light originally derived from revelation. It is not usual to call both *the Sun* and a dim telescopic comet or a meteoric stone, by the common name of *suns*. Thus too, we cannot speak of the fundamental doctrines of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, as being distinct from those of any other ecclesiastical organization and claiming only co-ordinate rank. The doctrines of *the Church*, as set forth in her Confessions, are identical with those of the Bible, and we decline the task of elevating any opposite doctrinal system, or any sect, to parity of rank with that which stands alone as—*the Church*.

the second edition, in which he replies to certain strictures that appeared after he had published the first edition: "Mais est-il un impie," he indignantly asks, "celui qui ne rassemble sous les yeux du lecteur toutes les religions du monde que pour montrer par-tout une même croyance fondamentale, et faire voir la vérité dans ses différents états de dégradation?" His "croyance fondamentale," or, "contexture essentielle de toutes les religions connues" as he terms it, p. 25, appears to have been as undefined in his mind, as the outlines of a vapor, that is slowly moving over a western prairie. In absolute despair of obtaining satisfactory information from men, whose opinions are liable to continual modifications, we apply to the fountain of all truth, and hope to find our difficulties removed, by searching the word of God.

When the sacred writer enumerates in Hebr. 6: 1, to which passage we shall afterwards recur, the titles of several elementary doctrines, and even uses the word 'foundation,' he intends, by no means, to give a catalogue of fundamental doctrines, in the current sense of the term. It is, however, usual to regard that passage as a guide, in any attempt to effect a union of sects, and, as the titles there mentioned, while their naked form allows the utmost latitude of interpretation, nevertheless occur in a canonical book, they are sometimes assumed to constitute the sum of our fundamental doctrines, with perhaps a short appendix directed against Universalism, Popery and similar ecclesiastical excrescences not known in the apostolic age. Nothing could be more unsatisfactory. Each individual will find some favorite doctrine or favorite aspect of a doctrine omitted in the short list, and real union is not accomplished. We propose to arrive at a point of view from which we can indicate specially the true fundamental doctrines, by another path, more circuitous and less frequently chosen, in this case, but, possibly, rewarding us by some results that are tangible and distinct; that is, if we can ascertain the nature of the *super-structure*, as far as it is the work of the Holy Spirit, we may, perhaps, be enabled to explain the nature of the *foundation*, which is also divine. The former, if correctly ascertained, will indicate the materials and extent of the latter.

The original word "foundation"¹ occurs in the New Testament sixteen times, and the corresponding verb "to found,"

¹ Θεμελίος, ου, ὅ, ἡ — or, το. It is found in the following passages either in a literal sense, or in one not appropriate to the present question: Luke 6: 48, 49; 14: 29; Acts 16: 26; Rom. 15: 20; 1 Tim. 6: 19; 2 Tim. 2: 19; Hebr. 11: 10; Rev. 21: 14, 19, 19. The other five passages, in which it occurs as a trope, are: 1 Cor. 3: 10, 11, 12; Eph. 2: 20; Hebr. 6: 1. The

occurs six times. Of these passages, by far the most important is 1 Cor. 3: 9-15. Its exegesis is, at the same time, attended with unusual difficulties. Without alluding to Universalist perversions of the sense, or papistical folly which discovers purgatory in it, we confess that the conflict among respectable and orthodox commentators is startling. Their views would not, perhaps, have diverged so widely, if they had originally avoided the error of pressing or urging too far a figurative expression which was not intended to present more than a general analogy. St. Paul, whose style is not constructed according to the rigid rules of rhetoricians, is more anxious to guide the conscience and improve the hearts than merely to gratify the literary tastes of his readers; he is justly emancipated from many rules of art by which uninspired men, occupying of course a far inferior position, are expected to model their writings. Thus, in Eph. 3: 17, ("rooted and grounded in love,") he compares believers in the same clause to both plants and buildings; in Rom. 6: 4-6, a burial, a being planted together, (in the Engl. version) and a crucifixion, all refer to the same topic; in the passage before us, verse 9, believers are both God's husbandry, that is, according to the original, *field* (γεώργιον), and also God's building. These rapid transitions from one figure to another, indicate an unusual exaltation of mind, and show that the Apostle's whole soul was absorbed by the revelations which were, at the time, imparted to him; such was the grandeur of these revelations, so full, so mighty, was the current of inspiration, that the Apostle struggled vainly to find human terms which would adequately express those divine conceptions, and, regardless of the somewhat arbitrary rules of composition, which it would be puerile to apply to one who felt the divine *afflatus*, he simply translates into terms which are intelligible to man, the language of inspiration. We cannot, consequently, expect that in the present passage, the individual words, e. g. hay, stubble &c. should be nicely discriminated, and supplied, respectively with an appropriate spiritual sense; neither can the predominant idea of a "foundation" be rigidly interpreted throughout the passage and fitted precisely to others in which it occurs.

verb *θεμελιῶ* is used in a literal sense in Matth. 7: 25; Luke 6: 48; Hebr. 1: 10, and in a tropical, in Eph. 3: 17; Col. 1: 23; 1 Pet. 5: 10. It signifies, in general, to build upon a certain foundation. The masc. of *θεμελιῶς*, which is not a redundant noun, but an adjective with *λίθος* understood (Matthiæ Gr. Gr. § 95) appears to designate specially a foundation-stone, e. g. Rev. 21: 19, and the neuter, e. g. Acts 16: 26, a foundation viewed as an aggregate of these stones.

We insert the passage :1 Cor. 3 : 10. "*According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon.* 11. *For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.* 12. *Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble ;* 13. *Every man's work shall be made manifest : for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire ; and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is.* 14. *If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward.* 15. *If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss : but he himself shall be saved ; yet so as by fire."*

The "*foundation*" of v. 10. is declared to be "Jesus Christ." If the article before *Χριστός* is retained, according to the *text rec.*, the older exegesis which regards *Χριστός* not as a proper name, but as an appellative, would seem to be preferable, that is, Jesus is the Christ or Messiah promised in the Old Testament, as in John 20 : 31 ; 1 John 2 : 22 &c., and this would be the fundamental doctrine. (Mosheim, Elom. Theol. Dogm. § 7.) The article, however, is omitted by Griesbach, Knapp, &c. ; and Olshausen makes no distinct allusion to it, either in his commentary or his German version. Assuming this emendation to be justified by the critical apparatus of the latest and best editors, (and, we believe, its propriety is conceded), we fully adopt the language of the English version, in which both words occur as proper names, without any distinction, as in Matth. 1 : 1, 18, and many other passages. This "*foundation*" then, is not simply the doctrine in general *taught by* Christ merely as a teacher, or the doctrine in particular *concerning* Christ, as, rather, Christ himself in his fulness and his truth, teaching with a life-giving power. Gospel doctrine, essentially connected with Christ in all its parts — revealed truth, emanating directly from Christ — the religion of Christ, treating of him and leading to him — a system of truth which alone is perfect, and alone can purify, delight and save, and which, in its unrivalled completeness presents Christ as our "*all*" (Col. 3 : 11) — this is the "*foundation*." St. Paul, agreeably to his own statements in 1 Cor. 2 : 2, Galat. 2 : 20, Phil. 1 : 21 ; 3 : 8, declared Christ to be the "*author and finisher of our faith*," (Hebr. 12 : 2) ; he led those whom he addressed to Christ as their teacher, presented Christ to them as their example, represented him as the God of their love and their worship, pronounced him in his character of a vicarious suf-

ferer, to be the only source whence pardon and salvation flowed to the penitential believer, and fully coincided with Peter, who said: "Neither is there salvation in any other," &c. Acts 4: 12. This "foundation" Paul desired to lay in every heart, agreeably to his words: "I travail in birth again, until Christ be formed in you," Galat. 4: 19, and this work of laying the foundation he accomplished by preaching Christ with the aid of the Spirit. When an individual received Christ as his Lord and Saviour, and his heart was filled with love and faith, the foundation was laid. But v. 10, "another buildeth thereon." Who is this builder? Assuredly *not* a Christian teacher; this *builder* is, evidently inferior to the "master-builder," the name which Paul applies to himself. But this Apostle possessed too much delicacy of feeling to claim a higher rank than he assigned to his *fellow-teachers*, although he claims a species of paternal authority over his spiritual children, derived from his high office. As little would it be consistent with Paul's dignity of character to imagine that he covertly alludes to Apollos. Indeed, when he drops the previous figure of planting and watering, v. 6-8, he also drops the distinction which he had made between the teachers and the taught, and regards both as alike dependent on Christ for salvation; and this view is completely established by the emphatic expression: "every man," v. 10. The *ἄλλος* is the same as the *ἕκαστος* in v. 10, and as *τις* in v. 12. "If," Paul proceeds, "if this man, whoever he may be (*τις* v. 17) destroys the temple of God, God will destroy him." (The same verb, *φθείρω*, rendered *verderben* by Olshausen, occurs in both members of the sentence, although the English version presents two words.) It is inconceivable to us that Paul should speak in this manner of any teacher whose gifts proceeded from the same source which gave apostolic authority to him. The next verse, 18, permits no doubt to remain of the general application of Paul's language.

We assume, therefore, that the builder is—*every professing Christian*. What then is to be understood by the *building process*, or "work" or superstructure to which Paul now directs our attention, v. 12 sqq., or rather, of what *materials* does the latter consist? The literal sense is obvious; in the construction of costly buildings, in "kings' houses," gold, silver and precious stones were ambitiously employed: an inferior edifice consists of wood: hay or stubble is used in thatching a hovel. We find the solution of the question in the word "day," v. 13. It is mentioned in connection with a "reward," v. 14, and a "suffering of loss," v. 15, and, indeed, with a "fire," v. 13.

The *work* shall be "made manifest," by being "revealed by fire," for we regard ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα δηλώσει as a parenthetic or epexegetical clause, and take, not "day" as Olshausen suggests, but rather "work" as the subject of "shall be revealed," or rather, as it is in the original, "is revealed," (ἀποκαλύπτει), the present time, by an enallage, being use for the future, to indicate the certainty, or perhaps, the nearness of the event. (Winer, Gr. of N. T. § 41. 2. p. 209.) Analogous passages like 2 Thess. 1: 8, and 2 Peter 3: 10 imperatively direct us to explain this "day" as the day of judgment. Now on that day (Matth. 7: 22, 1 Thess. 5: 4, 2 Tim. 4: 8,) all will be judged (Acts 17: 31) and this judgment, strict, unerring and impartial, like a fire which purifies gold but destroys stubble, will manifest the nature of "every man's work." But what is declared to be the subject of that judgment, unless it be the *Christian character and life* of those whom Paul addresses? (Rom. 2: 16, "in the day when God shall judge the *secrets* of men," τὰ κρυπτά, die innern Vorgänge in der Tiefe der Seele, Ols. ad loc. — 2 Cor. 5: 10, "that every one may receive the things done in his body.") Such we regard as the "work" which a man builds on the "foundation." We now incorporate with our explanation another passage, for the purpose of obtaining additional light: "Ye are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone," Ephes. 2: 20. A change of the figure here occurs. In the former passage, Christ himself is the foundation, in the latter he is called the chief corner-stone, contradistinguished from the general foundation of which it forms, preëminently, a part, and the "apostles and prophets," (not the prophets of the Old Testament, but the "prophets" or inspired teachers mentioned in passages like Acts 15: 32, 1 Cor. 12: 28 &c.) now constitute the foundation" on which believers, in their capacity of believers, are built. The apostles, personally, are not our "foundation," but *the religion* which they were commissioned to teach, or, rather, the *doctrines* which are the sources of our moral duties. Thus, from the whole doctrine of God, in its vast dimensions, flow our duties to love, obey &c. him. From the doctrine of our corruption, in the detailed form deduced from the Scriptures, and presented in our Confessions, flow the duties of repentance, &c. From the doctrine of the Atonement are derived the powerful claims of Christ, not only on our love and faith, but also on our whole life. From the doctrine of the future judgment, with all the other truths connected with it, are derived

those solemn admonitions of Scripture to watch, work, pray, &c. &c.

We are now prepared to state our view of the nature of "every man's work." The *work* itself may be burned, v. 15, but "he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." The general idea is obvious; a loss is suffered, but not a total loss.—The Apostle designs to employ a simile, and might have introduced the case of himself and his shipwrecked fellow voyagers, (Acts 27: 44) "who escaped to land" with the loss of all but their lives; the word "fire" however, which had occurred in v. 13, suggested a corresponding image, equivalent to the expression: He has escaped from the conflagration with the loss of all but his life. The *foundation or doctrinal system taught by the apostles* was stable and had been adopted as a whole, by the individual; he has not been guilty of a deliberate and conscious rejection of divine truth; his faith was sincere; he believed in Christ. But sincerity of faith may co-exist with an imperfectly developed Christian character, and with a life in which the seed does not bear fruit a hundred-fold, but only sixty or thirty, Matth. 13: 8, 23. The "foundation" or general doctrine of the Scriptures may be received by two persons with equal candor; the one, however, better understanding the nature of the foundation, more clearly comprehending Christian doctrine, more exempt from narrow views of religious truth, more orthodox, builds on his fully developed doctrinal system a glorious structure of gold, or silver or precious stones; in him the Christian character attains to its highest development; his heart is the abode of every Christian grace; the virtues which adorned his Saviour are reflected in his own life; *he* will shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of the Father, Matth. 13: 43; for *his* work endures: "he shall receive a reward," v. 14. The faith of the other receives Christ indeed as its great object, but co-exists with a certain sloth (of which holy men have often mournfully accused themselves,) or with doctrinal defects, which will be obstacles to the harmonious development of character, and retard his progress in holiness. Readily admitting the truth of the Scriptures, he does not distinctly view every part of the "foundation" of truth. Some scriptural doctrines he undervalues, others he adopts in a mutilated form, while he assigns an undue importance to tenets or usages which are mere human inventions. These defects or errors in his faith, in as far as they affect his Christian character, and dim the lustre of Christian virtue in his life, lead him to introduce "wood, hay, stubble" into his work. Or, like one who erects a mean hut on a por-

tion of the foundation destined for a colossal edifice, he interweaves errors with sound doctrine, and neglects to build on the *whole* foundation—the defects in his doctrinal system induce defects in his heart and life—his work is burned. Still, “his heart and his innermost life-root remained with the Lord” (Olsh. on 1 Cor. 3: 15) and his soul is saved, (for we here entirely look away from the impenitent, unbelieving and vicious). He will not, however, occupy the lofty “mansion” assigned to *him* whose “work” endured the test, and he will be one of the lowest in the celestial kingdom. “Erunt enim discrimina gloriæ sanctorum.” Apol Augsb. Conf. p. 135, ed. Rech. The result of this investigation is, that doctrines partake of the character of “fundamentals”—that they modify the character and the life of the individual—and that, as God has revealed no truths unless they are designed to be a practical benefit to the believer, and, as every doctrine, nearly or remotely, exercises a certain influence, therefore, *every doctrine taught in the Scriptures is a fundamental doctrine.*¹

The force of this general conclusion is not impaired by the language in Hebr. 6: 1, 2. “Therefore, leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection: not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works,

¹ When the “World’s Evangelical Alliance” held its convention in London, August, 1846, a so-called “Doctrinal Basis” was ultimately adopted by the members, who exhibited in their ranks some of the most distinguished orthodox theologians of England and the Continent, as well as very eminent divines from America. A remarkable nervousness was shown by them in expressing their views of divine truth, or rather, a fraternal desire was felt to avoid the introduction of any doctrines which were not strictly “fundamental” in the most charitable and lenient sense of the word. The natural result was, that while various subordinate advantages were incidentally derived from this great meeting, not a solitary Gospel doctrine obtained a more favorable position than it had previously occupied in Christendom. Nay, divine truth was temporarily obscured. Their platform, it is true, even after being drawn out to the utmost extent which its caoutchouc properties permitted, did not afford room for Unitarians, but the original “Basis,” which professed to set forth “Evangelical views,” was less *Evangelical* than the Koran or Plato’s Dialogues, at least in the remarkable suppression of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. If the “American Brethren” had not insisted on an appendix to the Creed proposed by the “British Brethren,” and eventually constrained the latter to recognize *some additional fundamental doctrines*, this famous Convention would have doubtless adjourned, after proclaiming to the world, that when they had, with infinite care, placed in juxtaposition the mere *titles* of doctrines in which they agreed in general, still, the Creed which they engendered, after such magnificent parturient labors, did not present an honest and direct contradiction of the turgid infidel proposition: Death is an eternal sleep.—The excuse was, that “some good men were in doubt about the eternal punishment of the wicked!” &c. &c. God forbid, that the “doubts” of any “good men” respecting Bible doctrines should have more influence, or more effectually lead to the obscuration of truth, than the unintelligible sounds emitted by a newly-born babe.

and of faith toward God,—of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.” The slightest glance at this English version, shows conclusively that Paul does not, in the most remote degree, design to enumerate fundamental doctrines of *the Christian religion*, in the modern sense of the word. The key to the interpretation of the passage seems to be furnished by the words τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον, translated, “the principles of the doctrine of Christ,” and evidently identical with the subsequent word “foundation.” In v. 12 of the preceding chapter an analogous expression occurs: τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ, translated “the first principles of the oracles of God.” What are these “principles”? The epistle is addressed to *the Hebrews*, that is, to persons who had originally been Jews, and who were familiar from early life with the contents of the Old Testament, the Mosaic ritual, &c. (The questions respecting the region of country in which they resided, the authorship of the epistle &c. do not affect our argument.) St. Paul, whom we here assume to be the author, reproaches them (5: 12) for the inconsiderable progress which they had made in understanding the oracles of God, since their conversion from Judaism to Christianity. These “oracles,” as in the analogous passages, Acts 7: 38 and Rom. 3: 2, are *exclusively* the writings of the Old Testament. He exhorts them no longer to remain “babes,” but to strive after a fuller development of Christian knowledge and virtue, or go on unto perfection (τελειότης) of which, in Col. 3: 14, he calls charity the bond, and which is equivalent to the “perfect man” in Eph. 4: 13 as distinguished from the νήπιος, or “babe” in Heb. 5: 13. They are, consequently, exhorted not to remain satisfied with the “first principles” *which they had previously possessed as Jews*, but “leave” these behind in their *Christian* course. He then enumerates, as *specimens*, several points of doctrine, which intelligent and devout Jews held previous to their conversion to the Christian religion, or would not attempt to deny: 1) “Repentance,” a duty repeatedly inculcated by the prophets in various terms of equivalent import; 2) “faith toward God,” by which Habakkuk, ch. 2: 4, declared that the just should live—a sentence thrice quoted in the N. T.; 3) “the doctrine of baptisms,” referring to the familiarly-known Jewish purificatory rites, and properly described in the *plural*, which so much perplexes those who prefer the more usual interpretation; 4) “laying on of hands,” practised not only when the Jew brought his sin-offering, as a solemn typical act (Lev. 16: 21, Numb. 8: 12), but also when Joshua received his high

commission from Moses (Numb. 27 : 18, 23 ; Deut. 34 : 9) ; 5) "resurrection of the dead," a doctrine which the Saviour, in Mark 12 : 26, finds in Exodus 3 : 6, which Abraham understood, Hebr. 11 : 19, and which the Pharisees, in contradistinction from the semi-infidel Sadducees, tenaciously maintained, Acts 23 : 8, 6) "eternal judgment," a doctrine which, long before Daniel wrote the words, in ch. 12 : 2 of his book, Enoch had revealed, according to the testimony of Jude in v. 14, 15 of his short epistle. These several doctrinal points, long known to reflecting and docile Jews, were assumed as a "foundation," simply in the sense, that they imparted to the Jews a receptivity for the more full New Testament doctrines ; they were not precisely "the principles of the doctrine of Christ" as our English version speaks, as, rather, "the discourse or doctrine of the beginning of Christ," a somewhat awkward phrase in English, but which may be thus explained : the name "Christ," as in Rom. 16 : 7, 9 &c. is sometimes employed as a metonymy, to designate not so much the *personality* of the Saviour, as the *religion* of which he is emphatically the founder, precisely as "Moses" sometimes stands for the "law," e. g. Luke 16 : 29, or 2 Cor. 3 : 15, "Moses is read." In this sense Paul calls the doctrines now enumerated the *introduction to the Christian faith*, and his words are equivalent to the paraphrase : Leave behind those doctrines of the Old Testament which only prepared the way for the Christian religion, and advance in the knowledge of the doctrines of the new and better covenant.

From this examination of the passage in question, it appears that Paul does not here use the word "foundation" in the modern technical sense ; indeed, when we consider the extraordinary emphasis with which he elsewhere speaks of Christ crucified, we cannot consistently suppose that he would omit the atonement and kindred doctrines in a professed list of fundamental *Christian* doctrines. As no other scriptural passages remain which introduce the word, or throw more light upon it, our previous conclusion stands uncontroverted—that, as far as Scripture language serves as a guide, we are required to regard every doctrine of the Christian religion as fundamental.

It is, however, apparent from the discourses of our Lord himself, from the verbal addresses of the apostles recorded in the Acts, and from the epistles of the latter, that not only is every revealed doctrine fundamental in its general character, but that *all the details, and ramifications of any Scriptural doctrine, are also strictly fundamental.* While this very important principle is not, we believe, usually admitted, or at

least, not usually placed in a conspicuous situation, its correctness cannot be safely denied by orthodox Christians. The invariable results of any abatement of the rigor of this principle are unintentionally illustrated by the eminent theologian Bretschneider. He desires to be emancipated from the imaginary bondage of the Symbolical Books, and devises an exceedingly liberal and *convenient* theory, which will, as he represents, without destroying the unity of the church, permit us to abandon our Lutheran Confessions, and yet remain faithful to the Scriptures! "The church," says he, (Dogm. I. p. 59. § 10. b.) "does not lose her unity, even if her teachers according to the Scriptures abandon the theory of the Satisfaction of Christ taught by her Symb. Books, and consider Jesus as the Redeemer from sin in a sense different from that in which he is so represented in the Symbols. . . . Her teachers do not cease to be evangelical, even if they do not understand by the word "Redeemer" (*σωτήρ*) precisely a vicarious bearer of punishment, or one who offers satisfaction for the guilt of men; or by the word "Sin" (*ἁμαρτία*) precisely Original Sin, (a term altogether foreign to the Scriptures) or the guilt and punishment of sin, but rather the act itself of sinning." He also thinks, that the unity of the Church is not affected, if her teachers *abandon, or view in some other light*, many other tenets of the Church, and he specifies the doctrines of *the Trinity, the Person of Christ, Original Sin, and Baptism*, all which may, with perfect propriety be modified or entirely discarded, and that too, "on scriptural grounds" (aus Gründen der Schrift) by sound, orthodox Lutheran Christians! Such latitudinarian views really undermine the whole foundation of our faith; while the naked scriptural term is readily adopted, it is divested of all its hallowed associations, is ruthlessly torn from its position in the theological system, is thrust into the company of unclean doctrines which originate in pride and presumption, and is compelled to aid in the unholy work of demolishing that faith to which it owes its very existence. Who is Christ? The Unitarian answers that he is the Son of God. The answer is scriptural. Is Christ the judge of men? "The Father . . . hath committed all judgment to the Son" (John 5: 22) the Universalist readily answers. Is he the Saviour of men? The Papist assures us that *his* church so believes. Will God have all men to be saved? Calvin fully admits that *such words* occur in 1 Tim. 2: 4. Is Baptism a necessary and scriptural ordinance? None can doubt it, in the opinion of the Baptist. Is Christ the Head of the Church? The Puseyite wonders that any can deny it. Is man justified by faith?

The Methodist does not attempt to contradict us. We might multiply instances in which scriptural words and phrases are unanimously adopted by sects the most hostile to each other. All seem to agree with us in fundamentals. Still, we desire further information—these terms may have been vaguely employed. We propound more definite interrogations. Do you believe in the Trinity—in the union of two natures of Christ in one person, and the intercommunion of their attributes (*communicatio idiomatum*)—in Original Sin, or the entire depravity of man—in a general atonement—in the personality of the Holy Spirit? In what sense is Baptism connected with regeneration? In what sense is Christ truly present in the Lord's Supper? A storm of rebuke overwhelms us. These terms, we are told, are foreign to the Scriptures, they are human inventions, they belong to the dark ages; the Bible knows nothing of the "Trinity," the "*communicatio idiomatum*," and similar theological expressions. Neither are these specifications of doctrine fundamental, we are informed; it is sufficient that we agree in fundamentals, in essentials. Still, what *are* these fundamentals? In what respect is the Augsburg Confession "substantially correct"? A direct answer is evaded. Grieved by such unwillingness to adopt the *whole* truth, but resolved to adhere to it ourselves, we most positively refuse to be associated, by any liberal unsectarian process, with those whose views, when rigorously sifted, are found to be subversive in our opinion of the whole Christian faith, as we understand that faith. We *do* differ in fundamentals.

In this emergency, when all our hopes of effecting a union have been cruelly disappointed, we resort once more to the Scriptures, and we think that *there* we find the solution of all the difficulties by which we are perplexed. The sacred writers regard *every feature* of a doctrine as essential; they believe that the soundness or integrity of a doctrine depends upon its reception *in all its aspects*, and that no jot or tittle of the doctrine can be abandoned without weakening the foundation on which the Christian character and life shall be established. If the Apollo Belvedere, which is perhaps the noblest work of art in existence, had been found in the mutilated condition in which the Torso of Michael Angelo appears, the trunk, divested of head and limbs, might still afford a study to the artist, but the grandeur, the grace, the eloquence of the statue, would no longer enrapture him—it would cease to be *the* Apollo, and would be only the fragment. A doctrine revealed from heaven, but mutilated by human hands, loses its integrity, and is reduced to the condition of a body without limbs or an

indwelling soul. Paul says of those who maintained that the resurrection was past already (2 Tim. 2: 18), that they "overthrow the faith of some;" an error regarding the *time* of an event is here clearly a fundamental error. When "certain men . . . taught the brethren" (Acts 15: 1) that the divinely appointed rite of circumcision ought to be retained, as essential to salvation, whether as a meritorious work, or as an indication that the divine revelations of the Old Testament had not been disowned, they were not charged with having otherwise interfered with the apostolic type of doctrine, and yet their error was fundamental — it "subverted souls." (Acts 15: 24). So little of our modern toleration did Paul possess, that he wished that such persons were "cut off," Galat. 5: 12, precisely as on other occasions he anathematized false teachers. Thus too, the "doctrine of the Nicolaitanes," Rev. 2: 15, which, possibly, demonstrated its unsoundness chiefly by its influence on the character and life of its adherents, is mentioned by the Lord "with abhorrence." (Dr. J. G. Schmucker's Expos. of the Rev. *ad loc.*)

When Paul refers, Acts 20: 21, to the substance of his preaching, did he teach a "repentance" which the Papist can justly identify with his "penitence"? When Peter connects the "remission of sins" with the "name of Jesus Christ," (Acts 2: 38) the "many other words," v. 40, doubtless unfolded the nature of that "repentance *and* baptism" which he also mentioned. When Paul addressed the Athenians, and said (Acts 17: 26) that God had "made of one blood all nations of men," a doctrine so remote, apparently, from the Christian character and life as the "Unity of the Human Race," is clearly regarded by him as fundamental. When Paul directs the attention of Timothy and Titus to the subjects which they should teach, (1 Tim. 4: 11, 2 Tim. 2: 14, Titus 2: 15; 3: 8) he does not refer solely to doctrines which are now regarded as fundamental by orthodox churches, but also to detailed points or peculiar aspects of doctrine, not usually called "essentials," in the sense of "leading doctrines." Thus, while he warns against "doctrines," *δαιμονίων* (1 Tim. 4: 1) he states the truth "that every creature of God is good," &c. v. 4, and of such *apparent* non-essentials Timothy is directed to "put the brethren in remembrance," clearly meaning, as in 2 Tim. 2: 14, that otherwise his hearers would be "subverted" or meet with an overthrow, *ἐν καταστροφῇ*. Peter's address to Cornelius and his friends, Acts 10: 34-43, and Paul's discourse to the Jews of Antioch, Acts 13: 16-41, contain specifications of doctrine not found in modern lists of

"fundamentals." When James, ch. 1 : 26, says: "Pure religion and undefiled" &c. he does not intend to embrace in those few words a summary of *all* our Christian duties; and when the Saviour speaks of the knowledge of God and himself as eternal life, John 17 : 3, or Paul gives unusual prominence to a particular doctrine (e. g. that Christ died for our sins 1 Cor. 15 : 3, the resurrection of the dead, v. 12 sqq.) they do not design to furnish a summary of our whole Christian faith, or exclude other doctrines from the rank of fundamentals.

Indeed, there is another consideration which leads us to cling with unyielding tenacity to every minute portion of our doctrines, as fundamental in its character and influence.—"Every man's work" is the peculiar character which he possesses in the eyes of God, and the life which he leads. But this character and this life of the individual will be essentially modified by his views of Christian doctrines *in their details*. We cannot conceive of true holiness in which love to Christ is not a distinct feature. The old Christological views of our Symb. Books, which embrace the points of his two natures, distinct yet inseparable, his vicarious atonement, the intercommunion of the attributes of the two natures, &c., naturally afford a more exalted view of his unspeakable love, awaken a deeper humility, and far more powerfully and more divinely affect our feelings, than when we coldly assent that Christ is our Redeemer, and merely give a vague definition of the term. The structure erected on the latter loose and narrow foundation, will never attain the grandeur, solidity, extent and harmonious beauty, which more expanded views alone can sustain. The doctrine of the divinity of Christ, in its barren abstract form, and distinguished from the Lutheran doctrine of the intercommunion of the attributes of his two natures, as taught in our Concord-Formula,¹ can never have been *all* that Paul believed, when, after his abundant revelations (2 Cor. 12 : 7) he thought of the voice of *Him* who said: "I"—over

¹ It is to be understood that specifications of doctrines, like those, for instance, of the Concord-Formula respecting the Sacraments, the Person of Christ, &c. which no Reformed church has adopted, but which nevertheless enter so profoundly into the very heart of revealed truth, are claimed by us as strictly fundamental. However orthodox others may be persuaded that they are, we still believe that an escape from the adoption of the dangerous Nestorian heresy of *two persons* in Christ is logically impossible, unless we adhere positively and unequivocally to the Lutheran doctrine of the *Communicatio Idiomatum*, the admirable presentation of which divine truth in the Formula Concordiæ deepens the gratitude and veneration with which we regard that sacred Confession.

all, *God*, Rom. 9: 5—"I am (now) Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutest," Acts 22: 8. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper, which represents that ordinance as scarcely more dignified than a mere religious mnemonic rite, or any other mode of recalling Christ to the memory, or which finds in the Eucharist nothing more than a *spiritual* presence of Christ so highly etherealized or sublimated, that nothing but the mechanical manducation of bread, the deglutition of bread and wine, and the *word* "spiritual" are really retained, can never permit the communicant to be conscious of that depth of feeling; that profound veneration; that view of the high privileges of God's children; that sense of man's unworthiness and Christ's abounding love; that strength and encouragement in the divine life, which are experienced by the devout believer who acknowledges in mind and heart that *in, with, and under* the unchanged bread and wine, he has *also* received the true body and blood of his Redeemer. The Sacrament of Baptism, when viewed, merely as an initiatory rite, easily fades away from the affections. Unhappily, the views of the church, as detailed in the Symb. Books are either unknown to, or untaught by, many who should know them; the ordinance is misunderstood; and ignorance of its nature and design, far more than the blight occasioned in some regions by the presence and practices of the various sects of immersionists, has led to the neglect of Infant Baptism, and the serious decay of spiritual life in many souls. If Baptism be merely the application of water to the body of flesh and blood, and be *only* a "sign of the Christian religion, its value it would be sometimes difficult to demonstrate. The usual view of the ordinance affords a very contracted foundation for an extensive and lofty "work;" but when it is understood to implant in the soul of the baptized the germ of a divine life, and constitute a rich treasure, according to the profound doctrine of the church, it awakens new gratitude in the believer's heart, in addition to the blessings which it otherwise imparts; the soul is powerfully attracted to the divine author of the ordinance, and a foundation is furnished, by the fully developed doctrine of Baptism, on which a "work" may be reared, glorious to God, and blessed to the believer.

For, when Christian doctrines are studied and received in all their scriptural details, the truth, so generously imbibed, must naturally influence the character in an equally large proportion; when doctrines that enlighten the mind, control the conscience and melt the heart, are received in all the fulness of detail in which the church presents them in her Symb. Books, as de-

rived from Scripture, they must produce far more decided effects on the walk and conduct of the believer, than any mere general views could have accomplished. The latter, from their indefinite nature, not being sufficient to guide and control, nor being suited to the details of life and the ever varying emotions of the soul, connive at the presence of less spiritual and holy influences. Accordingly, the Hebrews (ch. 6: 1) are exhorted to develop and extend their knowledge of revealed truth, in order that a larger and surer basis of a holy life may be secured. The Saviour's prayer is: "Sanctify them through thy truth". John 17: 17. St. Paul prays that the Colossians (1: 9) might be filled with the knowledge of God's will in *all* wisdom and spiritual understanding, and regards their increasing in the knowledge of God (v. 10) as essential to the full development of their Christian character, and the exhibition of a holy walk. Timothy is urgently admonished by the Apostle (1 Tim. 4: 13, 15) to read and meditate. Such knowledge of divine truth, of which Christ in God is the sum and substance, received by the mind, believed by the heart, and embodied in the life, results in the gift by God of eternal life. (John 17: 3.)

It is self-evident, that no doctrine is received in its integrity, when essential portions are absconded. He who denies the doctrine of the Providence of God is rightly regarded as an alien: he differs from us in a fundamental doctrine: our whole conception of the nature of the Deity, our views of the importance of prayer, and the efficacy of the means of grace, our motives to obey God, our preparations for eternity, are all of a different character from his own. In reality the identity between his religion and our own, is destroyed. For the purpose of securing an agreement in fundamentals, however, he may be induced to recognize the *title* of the doctrine. Various texts which we, perhaps, adduce, he cordially acknowledges to be authoritative decisions of the subject. Do we, then, agree in fundamentals? Scrutinize his opinions, by detailing the ramifications of the doctrine, and the agreement vanishes like a dream. Even if the Scholastic *concursum* produces no difference in our views, he may admit the principle of a general Providence, but absolutely deny, on supposed philosophical grounds, the truth of our views respecting a special Providence; he derides the doctrine that, while God "delivers from the snare of the fowler and from the noisome pestilence," (Ps. 91: 3) he also literally "numbers the very hairs of our head," (Matth. 10: 30). Such views are inconsistent with the majesty of God, as he believes, and he concedes only

a divine superintendence in general, but not a divine attention to particulars, forgetting the oft-repeated truth that particulars really constitute a general class. The whole doctrine is thus dimmed, attenuated, mutilated, and nothing but a lifeless trunk remains. In vain do we attempt to conceal the discrepancy of our views, — we do *not* accord in fundamentals with those who, in any degree, impair the integrity of a doctrine.

The principle extends even to points which, in a certain sense, are not really stringently decided in Scripture. It is supposed that we may agree in fundamentals with others whose views of church-government differ from our own. It is true that no rule is distinctly announced in Scripture relative to the institution of Synods, Conventions, Presbyteries, Classes or Conferences. When however *Episcopal* ordination, (using the word in the Church-of-England sense), is regarded as the seal without which the preaching of the word and the administration of the Sacraments possess no validity, a fundamental error is introduced, which, while it attempts to dis sever *us* from the church of Christ, in reality vitiates and unchristianizes the whole system into which it has insidiously stolen. Thus too, rigid Calvinistic views of doctrine, embracing the reprobation of non-elect persons, are fundamentally distinct from our own. It is impossible, that a Calvinist and Lutheran can form the same conception of the nature of the Supreme Being. To the former he is not the benignant, impartial God in whom the latter believes; the former regard the atonement through a medium which dims its splendor and contracts its limits; the latter looks with cheerful confidence to his Redeemer, and confesses that the plan of salvation devised by God, in its grandeur and extent, is truly worthy of God. Indeed, a limb of the body does not more truly consist of nerves, muscles, bones and parts, of which the most minute cannot be extirpated without loss, than any special doctrine consists of particulars, none of which can be sacrificed without essential harm. The destruction of the smallest nerve in one of the extremities is felt throughout the system, the denial of any constituent portion of divine truth, essentially impairs the vitality of the whole system of faith, and introduces the seeds of death. The antipodal position of Lutheranism and Methodism, in regard not only to doctrines, but also, preëminently to usages, is obvious.

The inspiration of the Scriptures is a fundamental doctrine. There is a sense of the term, however, in which even the Rationalist can adopt it. Or, individuals who conscientiously disavow that name, and confess that the Scriptures are inspired

writings in a more favorable sense, may nevertheless entertain such low views of the infallibility of the canonical writers, or discover in them so many instances of a want of knowledge, that when this doctrine has passed through the process of filtration, the Scriptures hold no higher rank than the works of ordinary men of acknowledged wisdom and piety. Now, this result destroys all the authority of the Bible, and subverts our faith; we learn again that doctrines are fundamental in the sense that all their details are fundamental. Indeed, on such principles we refuse to acknowledge the orthodoxy of Socinians, who employ all the Scripture terms with which we are familiar, and freely admit that Christ is our Redeemer, but who are nevertheless fundamentally heterodox.¹

If these principles are correct, it becomes a less embarrassing task to specify the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith in detail. We cannot dispose of the subject by simply taking the Bible as our Creed; when we confine ourselves to this course, all the mooted questions of controversial theology rise up again in their undetermined form, as phantoms of the night. We prefer to study, first, the Scriptures, and then, the ways of God in his Church. We discern his goodness in ultimately securing the victory to the cause of truth after every conflict. We are profoundly impressed by his wonderful ways in guiding the progress of the great Reformation; we perceive with delight that he "left not himself without witness" (Acts 14: 17) in the moral as well as the physical world, and that he raised up men, who understood and prized the truth; even as Luther, by his divine grace, had been taught to understand

¹ The excessive liberality of sentiment of our day, which assumes the name of charity, and prides itself on its freedom from sectarianism, is often, either only affectation, or really latitudinarianism. The zeal to adopt the smallest possible number of distinctive doctrines, for the purpose of accommodating the largest number of sects, at last retains as little of the actual stock of Bible doctrine, as the Wolfian school of critics retained of the real Homer, if even they grant the venerable bard permission to *have really existed*. This literary heresy of Wolf and his followers is, we are happy to persuade ourselves, discarded at least by British scholars, if we may judge from the tone, not only of Mure's recent "Critical History of the Language and Literature of Ancient Greece," but also of the two very favorable reviews of that work, which appeared simultaneously (October, 1850) in the Edinburgh and the London Quarterly Reviews. The Homeric Controversy, respecting the unity of design and composition as well of the Iliad as of the Odyssey, and the common authorship of both, partially assumes a theological aspect, at least in so far, that the bold criticism which can sanction a theory destitute, as we have always thought, even of verisimilitude, when we regard the question in its general features, and can create many Homers, when the appearance of even *one* in the world is well nigh as wonderful as the appearance of one Luther or one Washington, and is precisely the same which, in various forms of practical unbelief, has attempted to violate the sacred Canon.

and prize it. We find the whole system of our holy faith elaborated in the most conscientious manner, in our Confessions, or Symbolical Books, from the Augsburg Confession to the Concord-Formula. This "foundation of God standeth sure;" the faith propounded in these books has been severely tested; has been rigidly compared with the Scriptures by adversaries and adherents, zealous, learned and able men; has been, further, tested by the religious experience of some of the most holy Christians whom the world has ever seen, and the results have been glorious. In the *doctrine* of these books, not an error, not a defect, has been discovered; and they now stand before us as a monument of wisdom and piety, guided in the whole course of construction, by the illuminating influence of the Spirit of God. To these confessions we appeal; in them fundamental doctrines are fully developed; *they* are the test which we apply to every doctrine. *All* the articles of faith which they maintain, are fundamental—all the questions, which they either do not introduce or do not decide, are of subordinate importance, and cannot claim the rank of essentials.

We may now easily define the nature of *non-fundamentals*. This term is liable to misconstruction, unless the principle advanced above be rigidly maintained, namely that details of doctrines are fundamental. For non-fundamental doctrines are in no case elevated to the rank of "articles" or "Loca"; they are merely subordinate propositions, which stand in a relation, often loose, to leading articles. They often assume the character of theological problems, they are sometimes merely exegetical difficulties, and they may be maintained or rejected, without, in any degree, impairing the solidity of the structure of our faith; they are decorations or blemishes which adhere merely to the surface. What was the *precise* purpose of the "descent of Christ into hell"? Can corporeity be predicated *in any sense* of the angels? Was pride the cause of the fall of some angels? What is the precise nature of eternal punishment? &c. &c. The decision of such questions is not furnished by the Scriptures and not attempted by our Symbolical Books; it does not materially tend to the development of the Christian character and life, and, consequently, cannot be supposed to constitute a portion of the "foundation" or doctrinal system, by which our moral nature is influenced, and our external development controlled.

St. Paul, who does not confine himself to the figure of a "foundation" and superstructure, represents "unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, Eph. 4: 13, as the great object which Christian teachers should labor to realize;

those who are established in the faith are "full grown," those who are "carried about with every wind of doctrine," v. 14, are mere "children." He does not appear to refer only to very grave departures from the faith, and yet he regards defects in the believer's faith as a serious obstacle to his progress — or, to return to the former figure, any derivation from the truth, though it may seem so unimportant or non-essential a part of the doctrine, as to possess only a feather's weight, and to be liable to be affected by every "wind" or worthless opinion of an errorist, materially contracts the "foundation," and renders the full development of the Christian character and life impossible — the believer is sincere, but he remains an imperfect Christian — he is a human being, with a body and a soul, but in the immature state of childhood—he rears a "work" which may contain gold and silver, but either the foundation is weakened, or hay and stubble are mingled with more valuable materials — and his work is, in a large measure, liable to be burned.

The principles which we have here advanced, require us to watch with the utmost vigilance over the purity of our faith, as exhibited in our Confessions, and consequently demand at times painful sacrifices. We conceive it to be our highest duty to be faithful to God; we dare not connive at the suppression of any portion of the truth, which he condescended to reveal; and earnestly as we desire to see more than a nominal union of believers accomplished, we cannot contribute our aid to that work, if the least prejudice be thereby sustained by our holy faith. We offer the surest and best foundation for it — the word of God in its integrity. Indeed, no union can be real and permanent, which is founded on concessions reluctantly made, and, in practice, immediately retracted. Union will then exist, when God's blessing completes it, when his truth is boldly maintained, when pride and prejudice are permitted to become extinguished, and when no other desire actuates all believers than that of holding the truth *as it is in Jesus*, and of leading, by divine aid, a life of faith and love in conformity to it. May the Church of Christ speedily witness that blessed union!

ARTICLE IV.

"Life of Mahomet. By Washington Irving." "Weil's Biblical Legends."

By the Rev. C. Walker, A. M., Rector of the Episcopal Church, Winchester, Va.

THERE is a very convenient mode, quite fashionable at the present time, by which the advent of remarkable men is not merely explained, but shown to be absolutely necessary. The individual is regarded as the product, and at the same time, as the exponent of the age : a product, which if not realized in his case, would most certainly have been so in some one else. Columbus, it is true, discovered a new world. But, according to these notions, the age, and the moral and intellectual forces, then operating, would have produced a discoverer, even if Columbus had never existed. Lord Bacon, it must be confessed, gave the first impulse to the inductive method. But this method, would doubtless have been found out, had Lord Bacon, like his great namesake, the Friar, lived and died in obscurity. The individual, so runs the theory, is the representative man of his time ; the spirit and life of the age, manifesting itself in a personal form ; evolving itself, in the course of personal action. The new system of philosophy, or of religion, the new discovery, or poem, or scientific fact, are all the result of internal circumstances. "The philosophy of history, which may indeed be applied, with extreme caution, to great breadths and extensive surfaces ;" to centuries or to whole communities, is brought to bear upon single events and individual cases : brought to bear, in such a manner, that the biography, or the event, is completely enveloped, and lost, in a cloud of magnificent generalities.

Thus, for instance, to use the language of a living author : "if any such *pseudo* scientific method were adopted and applied to two such men as Martin Luther and Ignatius Loyola, it would be easy to shed upon the theme a glare of philosophic splendor. This pair of worthies might be held up to view as binary stars, revolving round a common centre, and exhibiting the counter-active forces moral and religious of the sixteenth century ! Each it might be said, and each as related to the other was the necessary consequence of the conflicting ferments of that stirring age. Each of these great men, we might be told, came forth when he came, and each was what he was,

and each did what he did, in obedience to certain occult forces, which, from the depth of ages, had been working themselves up to the surface of European civilization! The one was "an Idea" proper to Germany; the other "an Idea" proper to Spain; and the two were simultaneously evolved, by a silent energy of the moral system, then struggling into light, and asking to be defined, and to be uttered aloud, and to be defended, and to be consigned to future ages! Luther, according to some such theory, was the spokesman of the Teutonic idea of Christianity; Loyola, of the Spanish; and thus we should have before us the *philosophy*, of the reformation." As to the *facts*, being of little or no importance, and only worthy the notice of vulgar and unphilosophical minds, they can very well take care of themselves.

But while it is the part of wisdom to guard against these follies, to which we have made allusion; while we should guard against generalizations upon single facts; while we should guard against explaining the movements of an individual mind, or of a lifetime, by rules to be cautiously applied to whole communities, or to long periods; while guarding against these errors, it is, at the same time, all important that we should recognize and make due allowance for, the real influence of external circumstances, in the formation of any single character. While it is hasty and false to assert that any truly great or original man was wholly the result of the age in which he lived; yet it would be equally false to assert that he grew up in lonely greatness; that independent of all external influences, he attained his position of high preëminence. External circumstances, the providential junctures of events and seasons, frequently determine, always modify, the course of individual action. The man becomes great, not because he willed it from the first; not because there was an unity of design in his efforts from the beginning; but because certain events and occasions were presented; were seized upon as they arose; and turned to advantage. The unity of design arising rather from the constant application of the same principles to different cares; from the power of turning the incident, as it arose, to good purpose; in this manner, to a certain extent, creating other circumstances; the individual will moulding every such incident with its results into an harmonious whole; into the system, or poem, or discovery, which comes in its unity to future ages. For, instance, the extensive reading of Milton, coupled with the stirring scenes of the Commonwealth, had great influence in shaping his literary character. This influ-

ence may frequently be seen, Yet we may safely assert that no other man, in that, or in any other age, could have written the *Paradise lost*. Biography is the history and description of an individual. And as no two faces are alike, so no set of circumstances which will account for the acts of any one man, can be given as a reason, or will account for the same acts in another. While there is a general likeness which will admit of general calculations, as to the mass, there are individual and special diversities with each one, for which these general calculations can make no allowance. He must, therefore, in endeavoring to get clear ideas of any single character, pursue the old and humble, yet safe course, of investigating facts single and connected; of noting by what means the individual mind acted or was acted upon; was modified by, or itself modified, circumstances, to the production of great results. He must notice the man as developed and tested, not *created*, by the course of things going on around him. And from the mode in which he endures or improves the trial, we must form our estimate as to his real merit of character; as to the degree of approval or disapproval to which that character should be subjected.

Bearing these rules in mind, let us endeavor to apply them, in forming our estimate of that most remarkable man whose career is brought before us in these volumes. "They that see thee shall look upon thee narrowly, saying, is this the man that did shake kingdoms?" So far as regards mere results, no single human being, perhaps, has ever appeared upon earth, whose biography is more suggestive of serious reflection; whose life, and actions, and motives, are invested with deeper interest; have been productive of results more momentous, or of more extensive character. The cloud no larger than a man's hand, rising in an obscure town of Arabia, became, within the compass of a single century, almost coëxtensive with the limits of civilization. "In a period," to use the language of one of his biographers, "included within the lifetime of many an aged Arab, the followers of Mahomet extended their empire and their faith over the wide regions of Asia and of Africa; subverting the empire of the Khosroes; subjugating great territories in India; establishing a splendid seat of power in Syria; dictating to the conquered kingdom of the Pharaohs; overrunning the whole of Northern Africa; scouring the Mediterranean with their ships; carrying their conquests in one direction to the very walls of Constantinople; and in another to the extreme limits of Mauritania." Passing beyond these limits, in a few centuries we behold them establishing a kingdom in

Spain, which lasted upwards of seven hundred years; completely swallowing up the Greek Empire; only arrested in their progress through Europe by the arms of Charles Martel; and even numbering, at the present time, of their decay and decrepitude, one hundred and eighty millions of the human family. "If no other reason existed, the mere fact of these results would be enough to awaken curiosity. We cannot but desire to know something of the origin of a dominion which has spread so widely, and of which the foundation has been so strongly laid in so many minds; and, especially, to know something of the genius, and character, the principles and conduct of the man by whom it was set up;" in whom it originated.

And yet, strange as it may appear, in view of these results, there are few who have figured upon the page of history, whose lives have been more barren of commanding incident than that of him, with whom these great movements found their origin. A youth of not very unusual intelligence; an early manhood, devoted to trade and merchandize; a maturity of comparative leisure, following his marriage, which had removed the necessity of exclusive devotion to business; his first annunciation, of himself, as a Divine messenger, to his townsmen; the ridicule and opposition of some; the gradually increasing allegiance of others; the scene shifting from Mecca to Medina; the circle of incident widening to the tribes in the neighborhood; this being kept up until his death, comprehend the life of Mahomet; constitute the comparatively empty prelude to the magnificent drama of Islamism. Yet even in this apparently trivial circle of incident, we behold the growth and operation of a remarkable mind; a man, showing himself to be, essentially, "αρχὴ ἀνθρώπων," a king and ruler of men. Adapting himself to circumstances as they arose, and daringly using them to the advancement of a great purpose. Not the mere creature of external influences; yet drifted on by these influences, and making use of them, as they were presented, to the attainment of a point, of which he himself, in the beginning, had no conception.

What, then, were these influences under which the character of Mahomet was developed? A brief glance at his biography will enable us to answer these questions. This biography, so far as regards the point in question, may be divided into four distinct periods. His childhood; his opening manhood, as a travelling merchant and trader; his peculiar religious life, from his marriage to his first considerable success in making converts, in Medina; his politico-religious life, subsequent to this last period. The first of these periods, that of his

childhood, may be designated as that in which he was exposed to the influences of idolatry. That of his merchant life brought him in contact with the imperfect forms of Christianity and Judaism, then prevalent. The third of these periods, extending from his marriage to his success at Medina, may be regarded as one partly of ferment and indecision, partly of monomania and fanatical self-delusion; unconsciously deceiving others, himself being most deceived. The last of these periods, that following his success, may be regarded as a continuance of this self-delusion, to a certain extent; accompanied, however, by a consciousness of deception and fraud, practiced upon others; by a determination to rule, whatever might be the means through which this determination might be carried into effect. Let us, briefly, examine the influences of these successive periods.

The first class of influences, those of idolatry, will be best understood by bearing in mind the peculiar form of religion, prevalent, at that time, in Arabia. It was a mixture of Sabianism, the adoration of the heavenly bodies, a religion alluded to in the book of Job, and of Magianism, the worship of fire, as the representation of Deity, supposed either to have originated, or more probably to have been reformed, and reinstated in the system of Zoroaster. With these, there was also a complete tradition derived from the primitive ages of the world, containing, in an obscure and imperfect form, some of the historical facts of the Old Testament. Without entering upon a full examination of the systems to which allusion has been made, it will be sufficient to say, that whatever may have been the purity of their doctrines, at first, they had become corrupted, at the time of which we are now speaking, into the grossest kind of idolatry. The heavenly bodies, or material objects, at first regarded as symbols of Deity; made use of, in worship, as representations of the Supreme Being, had gradually usurped the place of Him whose presence they symbolized; and became themselves the direct objects of religious adoration. Indeed, the idea, which has been ascribed to Maimonides, "that all idolatrous worship found its rise in this way," seems not at all improbable. We know, for instance, as a matter of fact, that the religions of Assyria, of Egypt, and Phœnicia, in the later periods of their history, were of the grossest and most idolatrous character. The worship was addressed to the image, or animal, or reptile, or heavenly body, and went no further. Yet the researches of the last fifty years, in Egypt especially, seem to have brought to light, what long ago was suspected, that many of these direct objects of wor-

ship, were not so in the beginning; were originally mere symbols; represented symbolically certain attributes of the Supreme Being; but by a natural tendency of the human mind, were allowed to exclude this Being, and to become themselves the objects of worship and devotion. This tendency of the human mind is brought to view, and guarded against, in the Holy Scriptures. We find that the Jews were not only forbidden by the first commandment, the worship of all false gods, as opposed to that of the true; but in the second of these commandments, and with much more specification, they are forbidden to make any representation of Jehovah himself, as part of their religious service. These representations would not merely give false and inadequate ideas of the Divine perfections in the beginning, but in a little time they would be worshipped, in His stead. Nor do we advance far into the history of this people, before the wisdom of this inspired prohibition becomes manifest. The golden calf was set up in the wilderness, not in opposition to, but as the representative of, the God of Israel; the same thing was subsequently done, by Jeroboam at Bethel; in each case, the result following, against which they had been warned and guarded. The whole tenor of ancient and modern history upon this point goes to show, that any finite representation of the Infinite Being is eventually followed by the worship of that representation. The first intention may be innocent, may even be good, that of helping out a weak spirit of devotion. But the result will inevitably be bad. Let the representation of Deity be what it may, one of the celestial bodies, an animal, a graven image, or a painting; in a little time this representation will be the god of those by whom it was set up. And by a natural reaction of the human mind, revolting against the gross outrage which is being put upon it, this extreme of superstition will, ere long, be followed by practical, and almost universal scepticism. He who believes every thing, in a little time believes nothing. David Hume and Sir Thomas Browne, the extremes of the circle, come together at this point; occupy a common logical position: the point of agreement being the destruction of all substantial grounds of belief, or of rational conviction. "Whole communities," says Macaulay, with an expression of surprise, while speaking of the troubled state of Europe at the close of the eighteenth century, "whole communities passed from Catholicism to infidelity, and back again, from infidelity to Catholicism. But none became Protestant." The fact is not at all surprising. A mind abused and deceived, when it once begins to doubt, soon doubts every thing. And this same

mind, thrown off from all its moorings, if ever again agitated by the great problems of human existence, will gladly oscillate back to its original position, of unreasoning credulity. It was the credulity of childhood which prepared Voltaire for the scepticism of manhood; and it was the distraction and perfect helplessness of scepticism which drove him, in his last hours, to receive the sacrament, and extreme unction. The deformed and blind mother Superstition gives birth to the equally deformed and blind monster Atheism. And the children of this child not unfrequently exhibit the lineaments of their maternal ancestor!

This point must be definitely kept before us, if we would have a clear idea of what seems to have been the state of the Arabian mind, during the sixth century: it illustrates the influences, to which the youthful mind of Mahomet was exposed. The symbol had become the god. Even this gross and mangled form of religious life was almost extinct. And, as in the case of the later Greeks and Romans, idolatry, remaining as a form, was, in reality, passing away, into Atheism, and universal scepticism.

But these influences, although prevalent at Mecca, never had their full effect upon the youthful mind of Mahomet.—They were neutralized, to a certain extent, by others; by the local religious traditions with which, as a member of a priestly family, he was early made conversant. Ab Al Motallah, his grandfather, and Alu Taleb, his uncle, by whom, as an orphan, he was brought up, were the guardians of the Caaba, or sacred temple; the keeping up of which was intimately connected with these early traditions. Mahomet thus had the benefit of what little religious life was then remaining in the community. His position, moreover, in the family of the keeper of the sacred temple, brought him in contact with the multitude of pilgrims by whom this temple was visited; gave material forethought and inquiry to a mind which was naturally imaginative and restless. In these respects, he was elevated above the mass of his townsmen; was unconsciously preparing for the investigations of a subsequent period.

The influences of this period, as seen in the subsequent life of Mahomet, are of a twofold character. We see them in those portions of the ancient religion which were afterwards incorporated into his own system. For instance, the idea of certain places being more sacred than others; the doctrines of pilgrimages; the rite of circumcision; prayer; the doctrines of genii and angelic beings, all existed in the old system; did not conflict with his favorite dogma of the unity of God; and, be-

ing connected with the associations of youth, were retained, modified, no doubt, by the light of Christianity or Judaism, but essentially held, to the very last, as received in infancy.

Another effect of this period of youthful education, as seen in the way of contrast, and one more prominently exhibited in after life, was that of an intense and implacable hatred of idolatry and Atheism. "The followers of Mahomet," says a traveller in the East, "hate and despise every man who does not pray to God, in some form or other." For all others he has some degree of tolerance. We meet this feeling, upon every page of the Koran. Mahomet in childhood was an idolater; for even the Caaba was full of images; but not so grossly as the most of his townsmen. He was, moreover, a constant and daily witness of the formal hypocrisy and atheism practiced around him. His first revolt was against this state of things. The light of a later period strengthened this revolt; it became fixed and settled, by the opposition with which, in his first announcement of his prophetic mission, he was met. But the first impulse to this feeling, may not improperly be looked for, in the observations of childhood and opening maturity.

This brings us to the second period. From the twelfth to the twenty-eighth year of his age, Mahomet was engaged as a traveling merchant and trader, between Mecca and the neighboring countries. He was thus brought more fully under the influences of external nature; an influence, in his case, of no trifling character. The solitude of the desert; the nightly stillness and splendor of the oriental firmament; the traditions prevalent among the wandering tribes as to supernatural beings, by whom these solitudes were peopled, had no little influence upon the imagination of the youthful traveler. He was, also, brought into contact with other sources of information; with other classes of his fellow men; his mind expanding, by this varied intercourse and acquaintance. In this way religious truth, much purer than any of which he had previously heard, was brought to his knowledge. Christians and Jews formed part of the population of Arabia; and we have accounts, which show, that to these, no small portion of his religious development was owing. His conversation with a Nestorian monk of Syria, which is recorded, was doubtless but one, out of many, with persons of kindred sentiment. From these, and from Jewish traders, he obtained a general knowledge of the historical portions of the Old Testament and of many of the moral precepts of the New; correct ideas, also, as to the grossness of idolatry; as to the necessity of a purer

religion than that of his townsmen. The religious sentiment which had been preserved from utter destruction in the family of Abu Taleb; which, in this respect, elevated him above the mass of his people; was, undoubtedly, strengthened and purified during this second period. Whatever may have been his previous feelings towards idolatry, whether of doubt and suspicion, or of mere formal devotion, we may reasonably suppose that from this time, its power, so far as he was concerned, was completely overthrown. His mind, maturing in the reception of purer information, threw off much that was evil and false; took up much that was good; much that was imperfect, puerile, and perhaps evil: but, on the whole, he may be considered as having developed upwardly; as having made no little advance in his knowledge of religious truth. Whether he himself was fully aware of this progress, is another question. We find that no open revolt, against heathenism, was manifested, till some years afterward. His position, in Mecca, from the time of his marriage till his first annunciation of his prophetic mission, was that of a highly respected citizen; outwardly conforming to the religious worship then prevalent. It needed time and favorable circumstances to reveal even to himself the great change which had taken place.

But this second period is interesting on another account—as connected with the making up of the Koran. Most of the materials of this book were most probably brought together, in the mind of their author, at this time. Brought together, of course, without any definite idea of the future use which would be made of them; but simply as the result of his intercourse with others. Those who will have the patience to look through that strange jumble of nonsense, of religious truth, of moral precept, of gross sensualism, and poetical beauty, will find many allusions to facts, events, and precepts, to be traced to the Holy Scriptures, and to traditions, Christian, Arabic, and Jewish. Many chapters finding date in the necessities of a later period; at a period when their author was a much worse man than at the time of which we are now speaking, may properly be regarded as wholly originating with himself. But as these mostly have in view the excuse of some act of sensuality or perfidy of his own, or some cruelty of his disciples, they bring him but little credit. With these last and sad exceptions, the material of the Koran may be regarded, as at this time, being mostly brought together.

This brings up a question, which at one time formed the subject of much dispute and disagreement, the plagiarism of which Mahomet was guilty, from the inspired Scriptures.—

That he drew largely from both the Old and New Testaments, will hardly at the present time be denied. But these materials from Biblical precept and history, were incorporated into the Koran, from memory; without that regard or knowledge of the contents which one would exhibit, who was thoroughly acquainted with the source from which they were drawn. It was not that plagiarism which hides its theft, by changing the form and retaining in substance the literary property of another; but rather the memory recalling imperfectly what at first had been imperfectly imparted. Mahomet, himself, could neither write nor read. His knowledge of the Bible was obtained at second hand; and most likely through a polluted source; mingled with the monkish and Rabbinical comments and decorations of his Jewish and Christian instructors; modified by the associations of childhood; by Arabic traditions, in regard to some of these same scriptural narratives: this knowledge being imperfectly recalled, in after life, as occasion for its use was presented. This knowledge was too fragmentary; was not exact enough to bring him under the category of what is usually meant by the term plagiarist. He used, without scruple, what he had, whether in the way of illustration or direct precept. But so far from intending to hide the authorship of others, it may safely be doubted whether he himself could always say from whom his materials were derived. "I observed," says Joseph Wolff, "in Palestine, and in the deserts of Mesopotamia, that the Jews and Christians frequently entertain the Arabs by these Biblical legends. Many an inquisitive chief of a wandering tribe, will desire them to amuse him, with histories of their saints. Frequently I saw grave Turks, and Arab merchants, sitting in the desert, near a Jew, listening to him with attention, while he was telling them of the beauty of Joseph,¹ of the miraculous power of Moses, and the legend of the ascent to heaven, accomplished by him."²

¹ "The sun was declining when the caravan entered the capital of Egypt. But Joseph's face shone brighter than the noonday sun, and the singular light which it diffused attracted all the maidens and matrons to their windows and terraces. On the following day he was exposed for sale before the royal palace. The richest women sent their husbands and guardians to buy him; but they were outbidden by Potiphar, the treasurer of the king, who was childless, and designed to adopt Joseph as his son."—*Weil's Biblical Legends*.

² "Gabriel uplifted Moses so high into the heavens, that he heard the scribbling of the Kalam, which had just received the command to engrave the decalogue for him and for his people on the eternal tablets of fate.

But the higher Moses rose, the stronger grew his desire to see Allah himself in his glory.

Then commanded Allah all the angels to surround Moses, and to com-

I have felt delight in hearing the histories of Ishmael, when a child, how he cried and stamped with his little feet, while his mother Hagar, at a distance united her cries with those of her thirsty babe, which at last touched the Lord, the most merciful and most pitiful, to such a degree, that he sent the angel, who caused a well of water to spring forth, where the little babe had stamped his feet. Many a journey Mahomet must have made with Jews from Teman; and many a time must he have listened to wonderful stories from a Jew about the wisdom of Solomon: how that wise monarch knew the language of the beasts of the field and of the fowls of heaven;¹ and many a time he must have sat with Babina the monk, mentioned in Arabian histories, and heard the account of cures performed by Christ the Lord, and of the preaching of John the Baptist."

But whatever might have been the process going on, during this period, there was little time or opportunity, and there seems to have been little thought or intention, of working these materials into a religious system. Those who are disposed to regard Mahomet as having had a conscious plan from early youth; of working upon this plan, through life, to the attainment of a single object; may do so as a matter of theory, or to help out a string of rhetorical antitheses. But they do so in defiance to all fact; without the shadow of historical foundation. It needed leisure, idleness — the most prolific of all the sources of religious or philosophical heresy — to work

mence a song of praise. Moses swooned away, for he was wanting in strength, both to behold these hosts of shining forms, as well as to hear their thrilling voices."—*Ibid.*

¹ "Solomon commanded the angels to bring a pair of every kind of animal, that lives in the water, the earth, and the air, and to present them unto him. The angels departed as quick as lightning, and in the twinkling of an eye there were standing before him every imaginable creature, from the largest elephant down to the smallest worm; also all kinds of fishes and birds. Solomon caused each of them to describe its whole manner of life; he listened to their complaints, and abolished many of their abuses. But he conversed longest with the birds, both on account of their delicious language, which he knew as well as his own, as also for the beautiful proverbs that are current among them. The song of the peacock translated into human language means, "As thou judgest so shalt thou be judged." The song of the nightingale signifies: "Contentment is the greatest happiness." The turtle dove sings, "It were better for many a creature that it had never been born." The Hoopoe, "He that shares no mercy shall obtain no mercy." The bird Syndak, "Turn to Allah, O ye sinners." The swallow, "Do good, for you shall be rewarded hereafter." The pelican: "Blessed be Allah in heaven and earth." The dove: "All things pass away; Allah only is eternal." The kata: "Who-soever can keep silence goes through life most securely." The eagle, "Let our life be ever so long, yet it must end in death." The raven, "The farther from unkind the pleasanter." The cock, "Ye thoughtless men, remember your Creator."—*Ibid.*

these materials into a system. Had he been kept busily employed in merchandise, it is quite likely that Mahometanism would have never existed; that its author would have died a much better man, it is true, but unknown beyond the circle of his own community.

This leisure, upon his marriage, was afforded. He was placed above labor, or the necessity of care for his subsistence. His merchant life was not, indeed, at once discontinued; but became rather an amusement, an occasional occupation. Even this, after a time, was abandoned. His mind thus being released from other things, naturally reverted to those topics upon which, in his previous life, he had so frequently reflected.—With this difference, however, that topics which previously could only be thought of at intervals, became now the sole and undivided occupants of his bosom. He became, as might have been anticipated, a religious dreamer. Having little sympathy with the opinions of his community; not knowing enough of Christianity or Judaism to get a correct idea of either; deficient, moreover, in that teachableness and humility which are absolutely needed to the safe investigation of any truth, especially that of a religious character; those tendencies being increased by the influence of the renegade Thoraka, the relation of Cadijah, and an inmate of Mahomet's household. "Various passages in the Koran," says his biographer, "show the ruling idea which gradually sprang up in his mind. That idea was religious reform. It had become his fixed belief that the only true religion had been revealed to Adam, at his creation, and been promulgated and practiced in the days of innocence; that this religion had been corrupted, especially by idolatry; that different prophets, such as Noah, Moses, and Christ had been sent, at different times, to restore it to its original purity; that the then prevailing idolatry justified the hope and belief that another divine messenger would be authorized to begin the work of reformation.

Having arrived at this point, it needed but one more and a natural step to the conclusion, that he who had seen the necessity of this reform, should be the divine instrument to bring it about. An intimation to this effect was, in due time, received; and, shortly after, Mahomet announced his mission to his townsmen.

"It was in the fortieth year of his age when this first revelation took place. Mahomet was passing the month Ramadān, in the cavern of Mount Hava, endeavoring by fasting and prayer, and solitary meditation, to elevate his thoughts to the contemplation of Divine truth. It was on the night, called by

the Arabs, Al Kader, or the divine degree : a night in which, according to the Koran, angels descend to earth, and Gabriel brings down the decrees of God. During that night there is peace on earth, and a holy quiet reigns over all nature until the rising of the morn."

"As Mahomet, in the silent watches of the night, lay wrapped in his mantle, he heard a voice calling upon him ; uncovering his head, a flood of light broke upon him of such intolerable splendor that he swooned away. On regaining his senses he beheld an angel in a human form, which, approaching from a distance, displayed a silken cloth covered with written characters. "Read," said the angel.

"I know not how to read!" replied Mahomet. "Read," repeated the angel, "in the name of the Lord who has created all things ; who created man from a clot of blood. Read in the name of the Most High, who taught man the use of the pen ; who sheds on his soul the ray of knowledge, and teaches him what before he knew not."

"Upon this Mahomet instantly felt his understanding illumined with celestial light, and read what was written on the cloth, which contained the divine decrees, as afterwards promulgated in the Koran. When he had finished the perusal, the heavenly messenger announced : "O, Mahomet ! of a verity thou art the prophet of God, and I am his angel Gabriel."

And here the question comes up, was this all imposition, or was the deceiver himself altogether deceived ? We should say that neither of these suppositions seems to explain the matter in a perfectly satisfactory manner. Of the two, the latter seems nearer the truth. What is termed monomania, and which may be defined, as that distorted view of any single subject which destroys the natural relation of that subject to all others, was, doubtless, his state at this time, in regard to the matter of a new revelation. This intellectual distortion was no doubt increased by physical causes ; by his solitary fasts and devotions ; by the epileptic attacks to which, during his whole life, he was subjected. That mysterious action and reaction of mind and body upon each other, by which the mind, in a state of trance or half consciousness, reproduces and fills out its own waking thoughts, may, not improbably, have taken place in this instance. That which he wished he dreamed ; the single earnest desire of the heart was realized in the vision ; and he came out of the dream believing it, to a certain extent, to be a waking reality. That what has been said will apply to all the subsequent revelations received by Mahomet, we

have no idea. A vision which may take place in the experience of a Mahomet, a Swedenborg, or a Loyola, while the mind is perfectly adrift, or in a state of ferment, must be explained in a very different way from one which takes place, or rather is gotten up, to meet an emergency, or to fill out a preconceived system. Self deception may prevail even in this latter case, but to a much smaller degree than in the former.

But was this first revelation, so far as Mahomet was concerned, altogether delusive; such a delusion as involved no imputation upon his own uprightness and truthfulness of character? To those who believe that an accountable being is ever wholly left to the influence of external circumstances, to the mere sport of illusion, the affirmative to these questions will present no difficulty. But to those who think otherwise, the difficulties attendant upon such a reply are insuperable. This reply, moreover, is not justified by all the facts of the case. Mahomet was willingly deceived. The first false step, morally, in this whole matter, — a step which he had already taken — was that of identifying self with the anticipated revelation. To take that step previous to the reception of this revelation, was wrong; showed that spirit of egotism which involves moral unsoundness; that egotism which, placing self before all other men as the proper channel of Divine communication, prepared self as a willing victim for delusion. He hesitated upon the vision, it is true, but was easily persuaded to believe in its reality. With his state of mind, we may say this vision could no doubt have been repeated. While, therefore, Mahomet may readily be acquitted in this instance of the gross imposture which has been charged upon him; he had really taken the step by which he was prepared for it.

Beginning with this vision, the progress of the new faith, for the next thirteen years, went on but slowly. Little success and great risk accompanied most of the efforts for its extension. Some increase was made in the number of proselytes; and with this increase the belief of the prophet in his mission was strengthened, and the enthusiasm of his spirit proportionately inflamed. This latter feeling was probably heightened by the persecution to which he was exposed; by the losses and afflictions to which his followers were subjected; by the ridicule and opposition which finally drove him and them as fugitives from his native city.

This first season of Mahometanism is distinguished by one remarkable fact: by its resemblance in the patient endurance of its followers to the spirit of the New Testament. Not only were the precepts of the Gospel, so far as they were known,

adopted, but also the mode pursued by our Lord and the Apostles in making converts. Such was the contrast in Mecca, for the first four years, between the old and the new religion: the purity of the one, the forbearance and meekness of its followers, exhibiting in their greatest deformity the idolatry of the other—the intolerance, and vindictive spirit of its disciples. Persecuted in one city, the prophet fled to another; made no attempt himself, and encouraged none in his disciples, to enter upon a course of retaliation.

Thus far adversity had failed in bringing out the base alloy mingled with the new system. The first flush of prosperity did this effectually. Reason, and argument, and persuasion had failed. Fugitives from their homes, they were received with open arms, as sufferers for the truth in Medina; and this accession of strength at once suggested the sword as the great instrument of conviction. "Let all who promulgate my faith," so runs the inspired direction, "enter into no argument; but slay all who refuse obedience." The flame long pent up at length burst forth in all its fierceness. This first revelation of force, as the great argument, was followed by a treacherous assault, during the sacred season, upon some of his opponents; this being followed by a special revelation to justify the prophet in taking his share of the plunder secured by the victory. Mahometanism became a religious state; a state held together "by the cohesive principle of universal plunder." This being justified on the ground that those who were thus robbed and murdered were the enemies of God, and ought, therefore, to be exterminated. Adversity trieth the spirit of a man; but its opposite, prosperity, often does the same thing, and much more effectually. Mahomet withstood the former; but the latter, in its first assault, obtained a complete victory.

From this point the course of the prophet, in a moral respect, was downward. Gleams of past integrity, during his subsequent career, frequently make their appearance, so far as regarded his intercourse with his followers. Yet the general tenor of that life is suggestive of the most mournful reflection, especially so when we remember how that life began. Falsehood, sensuality, ferocity, bigotry constitute the dark list by which this period is characterized. The religious feeling, perverted and polluted to the basest purposes, merely gave a darker aspect to these crimes; excusing them and sanctifying them as being practiced in the service of the Creator. He who can regard the last years of this Hero Prophet, as he has been called, with any other feelings than those of pity, struggling with those of disgust and deep moral loathing, must himself

be sadly deficient in keenness of spiritual perception. As a youth, kindly receiving the few rays of imperfect truth in his reach, we regard him as an object of the deepest interest.— During his merchant life we could pray that the pure light of a pure Christianity, which he never seems to have enjoyed, might have been imparted. During his season of religious reverie and inquiry, these feelings of interest deepen; we look anxiously, but in vain, for that teachable and humble spirit, which, even with his imperfect light, would have kept him safe. Beyond that period there is a season of darkness, of doubt, of suspicion; one in which large allowance must be made, and plausible excuses offered, to keep him clear from imputation of falsehood and deception. But this season has an end.— There is a point beyond which excuse is impossible. How long before, then, he had begun to fall, we know not. We merely behold the plunge; the depth of moral degradation opening before him in his first deviation from rectitude; merely know: that when he fell he fell “like Lucifer, never to rise again.” His after life was a continued series of outward successes; but in the truest and fullest sense of the word he was ruined.

And here it may be asked, was he not, after all, as much a self-deceived enthusiast as a deceiver of his fellow men? Were not even these last and worst years of his life characterized by self-delusion; and do not many of his actions,—his conduct upon the death of his child—in his own last moments—show that, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, he was a believer in his own divine commission? To answer these questions correctly, we must first have the settlement of another: What was the amount of self delusion as coexisting with conscious deception practiced upon others? There is little or no apparent design, in his first communications, of imparting more than he himself believed. On the other hand, the trickery, and management, and falsehood, in many periods of his after life, are too palpable to admit of any such explanation; and show manifestly that he was conscious of the fraud and falsehood which was being practised. And yet the solution of this mystery may not, after all, be so extremely difficult. The same spectacle of overpowering fanaticism, coupled with a deficiency of moral principle, has not unfrequently been exhibited. The error is by no means uncommon, at the present time, and even in the most enlightened communities, of regarding religion as altogether a matter of sentiment and feeling; of regarding religious sentiment not as the impelling motive to the faithful discharge of duty, but rather as an equivalent for

this duty. This feeling it is which gives rise to pious frauds ; which has often led persons to use questionable and positively evil means to the attainment, as they supposed, of beneficial ends. A man thus deficient in moral rectitude, might, under the impulse of mere sentiment and self-delusion, be led to persuade himself that he was inspired ; and such being his state of mind, a course of falsehood or of imposition, if it seemed to promise advantage, would be used with but little hesitation : the end justifying, in his view, the means employed to its attainment. The fact that he feels and knows these means to be evil, not necessarily shaking his faith in the goodness of the end.

Thus for the first thirteen years of Mahomet's religious life, he might have believed in himself fully. There was hallucination ; not only mental but moral : but of these he himself shared most largely. But when his course was changed, and he was led to employ falsehood and violence, where previously he had used argument and forbearance, it does not follow that his belief in the thing formerly advanced by opposite means, was at all changed or shaken. He may have been still, in his own mind, the prophet to whom the revelation was first given : the Divine messenger, authorized to employ imposture to the advancement of the Divine purposes. He was thus a conscious and willful deceiver of others ; but to the very last moment of life was himself deceived and deluded. That kind of sincerity which is made up of strong conviction, without any regard to the process or means by which the conviction is reached, is perfectly consistent with great moral obliquity. "Even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, He gave them over to a reprobate mind ;" to the sincerity of a seared conscience.

And this delusion, instead of excusing, brings out the great and radical defect in Mahomet's character. A want of faith in the truth ; deficiency of moral rectitude. The first real temptation to deceive overcame him ; because he had not that reliance upon the truth, and the right, which should have repudiated all false and violent means of advancing its interests. It shows not merely a want of reliance upon the truth, and its Divine Author, but also a want of rectitude, moral rottenness, when a man endeavors to advance, even what he considers a good cause, by wrong and crooked courses. No such defence or assistance is needed ; all such assistance will, eventually, injure the cause in which it is enlisted. Mahomet failed here ; leaned upon what proved his moral overthrow ; upon what proved his destruction, so far as regarded any effort to find the

light for himself, to enlighten and bless his fellow creatures. There can be no better manifestation of the effect of deception and violence, in the advancement of what men believe to be a good end, than was seen in the subsequent history of the Prophet's immediate followers. "He himself, the leader, died of lingering poison. His earliest friend, who took the vacant throne, was in the arms of death when Khaled made him master of Damascus. Khaled was suspected and insulted by his people till his heart was broken. Omar was stabbed by an assassin. Othman was murdered by rebels. And Ali was pierced, even in the temple, by a poisoned dagger." Here, as in a glance, we behold the natural tendencies, the fruits of Mahometanism, as seen in the fate of its founders. Merely another exemplification of the fact, that they "who sow the wind," in due time, and inevitably "reap the whirlwind."

Upon two other points of interest we can only touch in the slightest manner. The one of these is the genius, the intellectual fervor of the founder of Islamism; the other is the essential nature of his system. The first of these, the genius of Mahomet, has perhaps been overrated. But when the deficiencies and advantages of his youth are borne in mind; when we remember the sway exercised over the minds of his converts, many of whom had been his bitter opponents; when we remember the infinite tact and promptness by which resources were brought in to meet sudden emergencies; by which the effects of defeat and disaster were neutralized; by which the disputes of disciples and followers were settled; when we bear these in mind, we must admit that he was a man of no ordinary character. No common man could have placed his impress upon so many of his kind and kept it there even for the ordinary duration of human life; much less for the ten or twelve centuries following. No common man could have fixed together the discordant elements of incipient Moslemism; could have given the impulse to a power which swept over so large a portion of the earth, and which, for a time, seemed almost irresistible. Some allowance may be made for the influence of enthusiasm; for the influence of a fervid imagination upon an imaginative people; some regard may also be had for the amount of truth contained in his system, the inherent power of this truth to carry the whole of this system forward. But making every such allowance, and we still behold an original, a master spirit, controlling and giving impulse to the actions of multitudes of his followers.

As to the other of these points, the religious system of Mahomet, it would not, perhaps, be far from correct to regard it rather as a Christian heresy than an original scheme of doctrine: that heresy which consists of a large portion of opinion previously held, mingled with some of the doctrines of the New Testament; the large amount of heathen error neutralizing the small amount of Christian truth. The Christian name being assumed, but the doctrine or opinion resting for its basis upon the Grecian or Oriental philosophers. One culminating point of these forms of heathenish Christianity, was that of Gnosticism, and subsequently that of Arianism: the disputes suggested by the controversy upon the latter of these giving rise to other and opposite systems of erroneous doctrine. During the sixth century, and in the East especially, these opinions were extensively held; the disputes carried on in connection with them being characterized on both sides by the fiercest and most shameful animosity; while in the West, where Trinitarian orthodoxy was comparatively pure, the church was verging rapidly to the image worship of the middle ages. This latter form of error, resembling so much the gross idolatry of Arabia against which Mahomet had revolted; the apparent Polytheism of Trinitarianism, coupled with the disputes and divisions of the Eastern church, led to the rejection of Christianity as a whole; to the formation, in name, of a mere system. Yet, after all, we find that this system is essentially that of one of these Christian heresies. Leaving out of sight the sensuality of Mahometanism, the doctrine of predestination, neither of which belong to it logically, both of which can be proved to have been suggested by emergencies, and it would be difficult to point out the difference between this system and that of Socinius or Priestley. "It was the idea of Mahomet," in his purer days, "that the religion which existed before the fall of Adam was the only true one." In substance, such is the idea of Unitarianism; and the idea logically carried out, must assume, that man is an undepraved being before he can be reasonably required to act according to the dictates of this religion. Of the two systems resting upon this fundamental falsehood, that of Mahometanism is, perhaps, the more vigorous. It contains a larger portion of supernaturalism in its doctrines of angels and spirits; has greater affinity for man's religious feelings; has manifested greater power in the work of propagation. But the main idea of human sufficiency; the logical rejection therefrom of a Divine Mediator; of a Divine Sanctifier; the absence of all provision for the pressing necessity of a consciously guilty and con-

demned soul; the rejection of all difficulties which human reason cannot comprehend. In all these respects they are essentially the same; and constitute, what may be termed the religion of human nature, previous to the influence of the Holy Spirit upon the heart, producing conviction of personal guilt, and desert of Divine punishment. Such a conviction, with all its humbling consequences, will have more effect in rectifying this class of intellectual errors, than any thing else that can be imagined. Let a man feel in his heart of hearts that he is a sinner; that the Infinite God will not look upon iniquity but with abhorrence; let him feel and understand this, and he will not only see the adaptation of Christianity, with its highest mysteries, to his wants, but he will be led to adapt himself to its pure and life-inspiring spirit. But let him fail here, and orthodoxy itself becomes but a barren speculation—a speculation at the mercy of every instinct of a proud and corrupt nature. The earthworm becomes the god; develops into an Emerson or a Parker; becomes an emanation of Deity, whose great work is self-glorification: a worshipper of self, theologically and practically; flouting at humility and lowliness of mind as inconsistent with the dignity of his position; a scoffer at all that is good, and pure, and humble, in the conduct of his fellow creatures.

ARTICLE V.

SCHAFF'S CHURCH HISTORY.

Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche von ihrer Gründung bis auf die Gegenwart. Dargestellt von Philip Schaff, Professor der Theologie im Prediger-Seminar zu Mercersburg, in Pennsylvanien. Matth. 13: 31–33. Erster Band: Die Allgemeine Einleitung, und die erste Periode, vom Pfingstfeste bis zum Tode des heil. Johannes, (A. 30–100). Mercersburg, Pa., Selbst-Verlag des Verfassers. Zu haben bei Ernst Schaeffer in Philadelphia und Leipzig; Rudolph Garrigue, New York.

By the Senior Editor.

THE publication of this work is pronounced by a cotemporary "something of an event." We feel prepared to say more, and to designate it as very much of an event; an event which

will reflect lasting credit on the author, and exert a beneficial influence on the Church of Jesus Christ. Before such an event can occur, according to the constitution of things, there must be several precursors, each of which is indispensable. In a hasty enumeration may be mentioned abilities of a superior order, a sanctified heart, thorough mental training, profound learning, a capacity for patient endurance, and the pen of a ready writer. To say that all these qualities are combined in the author of this history, may be thought to be high praise. We think he is very fairly entitled to the whole of it, and, in addition, to great gratitude, on the part of the theological public, for such a use of his fine endowments. We predict for this work great success, not only in this country, which may, in some degree, claim it, but in Europe, not excluding the Fatherland of its author. It takes its place aside of other works of a similar character, of which the German language can boast some of great value, without, we think, any reason to apprehend that it will not be treated with great respect. We can entertain no doubt, that the great and good man, to whose memory it is dedicated, whose recent death has excited intense sorrow throughout the Christian world, would have received it, had he lived, with high approbation, and felt proud of his pupil, who had so genially trod in his footsteps. We must not, however, occupy too much place in giving vent to our feelings of admiration, but furnish some general account of the production, which may serve to guide to a knowledge of its true character and pretensions. The volume is a stout octavo, containing 576 pages, and is designed as the commencement of a History of the Christian Church from its foundation to the present time. The first volume, now before us, contains a general introduction, and the first period from Pentecost to the death of the Apostle John. Other volumes will follow, we hope speedily, carrying on the history *ad nostra tempora*. To furnish an idea of the author's views, we give the following extract from the Preface, taken from the *Mercersburg Review*: "To portray, with conscientious fidelity to original documents, in clear life-like representation, the History of the Church of Jesus Christ, the incarnate Son of God and Redeemer of the world, to reproduce her inward and outward fortunes, her conflicts and victories, her sorrows and joys, her thoughts, words and deeds, with ardent love for the truth and broad catholic feeling, and to hold up this picture of eighteen centuries to the view of the present time as the most perfect defence of Christianity, for instruction and warning, for edification and example: this is a task, well worthy to engage the best powers

of a long life, and carrying with it the largest reward, but at the same time so vast and wide, that its execution, if it is to be in any measure satisfactory, can be reached only by the co-operation of the most various agencies. The single workman, especially one of subordinate capacity, must count it honor and happiness enough, if he be permitted to contribute some stones merely to the gigantic structure, which in its very nature cannot be completed till the church shall have reached the goal of her history. For science grows with experience, and becomes ultimately complete only by its means. — My plan aims, under the guidance of our Lord's twin parables of the mustard seed and leaven, and from the best sources within our reach, to sketch as far as possible a true and graphic picture of the internal and external progress of the Christian Church from its foundation down to our time, for the benefit both theoretically and practically of ministers and theological students, and to aid in this way a proper understanding of the present and a wise hopeful activity for the interests of the future. As regards compass, I propose to steer midway, between the synoptical brevity of a mere compend, and the voluminous fullness of a work which seeks to exhaust its subject and is designed simply for the professional scholar. The number of volumes will correspond probably with the periods presented in the General Division. I know too well already, however, the uncertainty of any such calculation, to lay myself here under any fixed bond in advance, or even to promise absolutely the continuation of the work. The volume now published has turned out much larger than I at first designed. The Apostolical period, however, in view of its fundamental and normative significance, is fairly entitled to a more extensive treatment than the Periods that follow; and it seemed to me necessary, moreover, to take account directly and indirectly of the late efforts of Baur and his school, having for their object, with no small outlay of learning, sagacity and art, a reconstruction of primitive Christianity, or more properly its destruction, which has had the effect of swelling considerably the number of notes. While now my book shows signs on every page of its German origin, it is still primarily and immediately designed for American readers, and written, so to speak, from an American, or more strictly, Anglo-Germanic position. I have accordingly had regard more or less to the more important productions of English literature, touching on the same field; and propose in later parts of the work, in case it is continued, to treat of English, Scotch and American Church History at much greater length, than is done usually in German works of the same size. Ger-

many has no lack of books on Ecclesiastical History; even since this volume has been in the press, three valuable new compends have appeared there from Lindner, Fricke and Jacobi — with which, however, my work, from its difference of plan and size, comes into no conflict. Widely different is the case in America, where it has been the fashion heretofore in almost all Theological Seminaries, as in England also, to rest satisfied with a translation of Mosheim. Quite recently, however, translations also of the works of Neander and Gieseler, still unfortunately incomplete, are coming to be widely studied, and the time is not far distant, when this energetic, restlessly active motion of the future shall do its part likewise in the independent culture and promotion of the science of general Church history. Of this we have a guaranty already in the able contributions that have been made to particular sections of this discipline, as well as in the distinguished success with which several highly gifted Americans have been crowned in the department of profane history. Would that I could do something, in my humble measure, to encourage an impartial study of historical theology in my adopted country, and excite to works that may leave my own far behind! Education and outward position seem to impose it on me as a duty, in this time of critical transition, and on this ominous musterfield of all the good and bad powers of waning Europe and youthfully fresh America, to labor in the service of German theology for American use, and as far as in me lies to mediate thus between the most theoretical and the most practical of existing nations, between the Greeks and the Romans of the modern world."

Wishing to make our readers acquainted with the ample bill of fare which has been prepared for their nourishment, we cannot do better than to give, from an article in the *Mercersburg Review*, we presume from the pen of Dr. Nevin, the resumé of its contents. "It commences with a masterly and well digested introduction, reaching through seventy-eight pages, and embracing the following scheme of chapters and sections: I. *History* — 1. Its conception; 2. Its factors; 3. The central position of religion in history. II. *The Church* — 1. Idea of the church; 2. Its development; 3. The church and the world. III. *Church History* — 1. Definition; 2. Compass; 3. Relation to other branches of theology; 4. History of the growth and persecution of the church; 5. History of doctrines; 6. History of practical religion, government and discipline; 7. History of worship; 8. Sources; 9. Compensation for the study of sources; 10. Method of historiography; 11. Division of Church History; 12. General characteristics

of the three grand Eras of Church History; 13. The uses and advantages of the science. IV. *The progress of Church History as a Science*—1. Church Historians before the Reformation; 2. Roman Catholic Historians; 3. Protestant Historians to the time of Semler; 4. Protestant Historians since Semler. The entire history of the Church, from the beginning down to the present time, is divided into three grand eras, each falling again into as many separate subordinate periods. The First Era is that of the Primitive or Græco and Latin Universal Church, extending from the day of Pentecost to the time of Gregory the Great (a. 30–590); embracing as its three periods the Apostolical Church, to the death of the Apostles; the Church under persecution, to the time of Constantine (a. 311); and the Church of the Græco-Roman Empire, amid the storms of invasion and revolution which brought on finally its fall. The Second Era is that of the Church of the Middle Ages or of Romano-Germanic Catholicism, reaching from the time of Gregory down to the Reformation (a. 590–1517), with its three periods of the commencement of the Middle Ages, the planting of the Gospel among the Germanic nations on to the rise of Hildebrand (a. 1049), the Bloom of the Middle Ages, the palmy period of the Papacy, Monasticism, Scholasticism, and Mysticism, on to the time of Boniface VIII. (a. 1303), and the Decline of the Middle Ages opening the way to the Reformation.

The Third Era, finally, is that of the Modern or Evangelical Protestant Church in conflict with the Roman Catholic, from the Reformation to the present time; having for its subordinate periods, the Reformation, or Productive Protestantism, as it appears in the sixteenth century, Orthodox Scholastic Protestantism, characteristic of the seventeenth century and the first part of the eighteenth, and Unchurchly Negative Protestantism, (Rationalism and Sectarianism) preparing the way transitionally for a new era. The volume now offered to the public, it will be perceived, is occupied altogether with the first period simply of the first era in this scheme. It confines itself, as before said, to the consideration of the Apostolical Church. Here we have an Introduction, looking directly to the history in hand. This brings into view the general relation of Christianity to the previous state of the world, the historical preparation for it which went before in the form of Paganism as well as in that of Judaism—the Grecian culture, its decline, Platonism, the Roman Empire, its interior state, Stoicism, the Old Testament Revelation, the political condition of the Jews when Christ came, their religious state—the influence of Juda-

ism on Paganism, and of this last again on the first — all conspiring to show the need of Christ and to make room for his coming. Book first, in the next place, treats of the founding of the church, its spread and persecution, under a division of five chapters. Chap. I, sets before us its proper Birth Day, the miracle of Pentecost, the gift of tongues, the preaching of Peter, and its memorable results. Chap. II, has for its title, *The Mission in Palestine and the Way opened for the Conversion of the Gentiles*—with the topics: *The fortunes of the Church at Jerusalem; Stephen, the first martyr; Christianity in Samaria and the ministry of Philip; the conversion of Cornelius; Commencement of the Mission amongst the Gentiles; the Congregation at Antioch, and rise of the Christian name.* Chap. III, is devoted to the life and labors of the Apostle Paul and the planting of the Gospel among the Gentiles, in a series of sections, extending through more than a hundred pages, that serve to bring into view all the leading occasions of his history and the various important relations of his ministry to the progress of the Christian cause.

His early character and education, his conversion, his call to the Apostleship, his missionary activity, his various journeys, his epistles, his controversies with heretics, his manifold persecutions and trials, all receive proper consideration. Here also various chronological questions and other doubtful points of history are examined with no small amount of learned diligence.

Chap. IV, treats of the labors of the other Apostles on to the destruction of Jerusalem: *The character of Peter; his position in the history of the Church; his later labors; his Epistles; his residence at Rome and martyrdom; James the Just; the Epistle of James; Traditions concerning the Apostles; the overthrow of Jerusalem.* Chap. V, gives us the life and works of St. John, his birth and education; his apostolical activity; his banishment under Domitian to Patmos; his return to Ephesus and the close of his life there; his character as compared with Peter and Paul; his writings — Gospel, Epistles, Apocalypse. Book Second has for its general subject the *Practical Religious Life of the first Christians.* Chap. I. *The influence of Christianity on the Moral Relations.* Topics: *The New Creation; the Apostles; Family life; Marriage and Celibacy; Christianity and Slavery; Christianity and Brotherhood; Social and National Life.* Chap. II. *Spiritual Gifts.* Chap. III. *Church Discipline.* Book Third is an interesting view of the Government and Worship of the Apostolical Church. Chap. I. *The ministerial office in general. To-*

pics: Its origin and design; its derivation from the Apostolate; distinction into Church and Congregation offices; Election and Ordination of officers; Support of ministers; Relation of officers to the Congregations. Chap. II. Church Officers; the Apostolate; Prophets; Evangelists. Chap. III. Congregational officers; Presbyter-bishops; their office; Deacons; Deaconesses; Angels of the Apocalypse. Chap. IV. Divine Service. Topics: Signification of Christian Worship and its relation to the Jewish; Sacred places and seasons; Sunday; Year Festivals; Separate parts of worship; Baptism; Infant Baptism; The Lord's Supper; other Sacred Rites. Book Fourth treats of Doctrine and Theology. Chap. I. The Apostolical Literature and Theology in general; origin of the New Testament; the Historical Books; John and the other Evangelists; the Acts of the Apostles; Didactic Writings; the Apocalypse; Organism of the Apostolical Literature; Language and Style of the New Testament. Chap. II. The Apostolical Types of Doctrine: Origin and Unity of the Apostles' Doctrine; Difference Jewish and Gentile Christianity; Jewish Legal type of James; James and Paul; Jewish Prophetic type of Peter; Matthew, Mark and Jude; Gentile type of Paul; Luke and the Epistle to the Hebrews; Ideal type of John. Chap. III. Heretical Tendencies: Conception of Heresy; Division and General Character of Heresies; Typical Signification of the Apostolical Church."

We presume that no one will look over this outline without being convinced that it promises a very rich entertainment—amply covers the entire ground, and brings up for examination subjects of the deepest and most lasting interest to the Divine and the Christian. If the question were propounded to us: How has the author accomplished the task assumed by him? in addition to our general response already rendered in the premises, we would say, that he presents to us discussions on the numerous and momentous subjects, of which the outline has been given, marked by great ability, sound judgment, elevated piety, extensive research and genuine Catholicism. We think that our common Christianity, in the various Evangelical forms in which it is found, will bring no charge of heresy, utter no complaint and manifest no disappointment. It strikes us, that it would be exceedingly difficult to write a book of this kind, we mean an honest book, as we are satisfied this is, that would embrace so much that all Christians regard as true, and at the same time so little from which there might be dissent.

From the first page to the last, we admire the soundness, we may say orthodoxy of the writer. Yet he does not get at his results, always, in the same way that we generally do. We might refer, as an illustration, to his articles on infant baptism and the Lord's day. With his conclusions on these points, all pedo baptists and advocates of the sanctification of the Lord's day would agree, though they might regard the process by which he reaches them as novel. On some topics, the author is satisfied with views which have not been current in this country, but they have respect to no vital doctrine or fact of Christianity. The interpretation of the gift of tongues might be mentioned as one instance, and the opinion in regard to the date of the Pastoral Epistles and the second imprisonment of Paul as another. On the first point it is maintained that, although on the day of Pentecost, there was a literal speaking of tongues, or languages, which had not been learned, yet subsequently and particularly in the Corinthian Church, the phenomenon was of a different character. A single imprisonment of Paul is all that is considered admissible. But these are matters confessedly difficult, and in reference to which, as there has been, so there is likely to be diversity of views. If the question were to be decided by authority, it is hard to tell where the decision would fall.

The literary execution of this work is admirable. The style, whilst perfectly idiomatic, is remarkably clear; abounding in beauties, it is manly and chaste. Free from the mysticism which has so frequently been charged upon German authorship, and sometimes, we think, with much reason, it unfolds in perspicuous phrase the clear conceptions of the author. Although we have noticed typographical errors, and taking the entire work not a few, we nevertheless wonder how, with the disadvantages under which this work was brought out, it could be kept so immaculate.

It is in a high degree to be desired, that there should be no delay in rendering into English this important publication. Well suited to the wants of the English, the American Church, it would doubtless meet with a rapid sale, and, unless it should in its subsequent parts become too extensive, be adopted generally, if not universally, in our Theological Seminaries as a text book.

No one acquainted with the subject will deny, that the only book on Church History in our language suited to be used as a text book, Mosheim, is, with all its merits, but poorly adapted to present, in the most striking and impressive form, the rise and progress of the Christian faith. The modern era of Church

history has given an entirely new phase to the science, disencumbered it of much of its rubbish, and rendered it subservient in a high degree, not only to spiritual edification, but confirmation in the divine origin of that religion, whose wonderful achievements it records. When we compare Mosheim with Neander in their effects on the student, it will be found that the one exhibits Christianity as depressed, degraded—struggling with corruption and hardly sustaining itself—in the pages of the other, it is a powerful principle, combating with irresistible energy every foe, triumphing over all opposition—displaying its divine origin, and challenging universal homage. So we find it too in the pages of Schaff. We rise from the perusal of the latter, with our hearts warmed and with a stronger conviction, that we have not followed cunningly devised fables.

We hope that the esteemed author will be encouraged to appear very soon with another volume, and that the work will proceed to its completion with as little delay as possible. We shall advise all who can read it, to whom we may have access, to purchase it, as we do now all the readers of the Review, who are masters of the German, to procure for themselves, as early as possible, copies. Of one thing we are sure, that when they get possession of the book and taste it, they will need no stimulus from without to induce them go on, but, we hope, in doing so, that they will not fall into the error of the writer—of permitting its charms to sweep them over the track with rail—road velocity, for that is, as all know, unpropitious to the highest mental improvement.

We had designed translating some portions as specimens, but must for the present defer it for want of space.

ARTICLE VI.

JOURNAL OF A VOYAGE FROM PHILADELPHIA TO EBENEZER, IN GEORGIA, &c., IN THE YEARS 1774 AND 1775, BY HENRY MELCHIOR MÜHLENBERG, D. D.

Translated from an unpublished German manuscript, by Rev. J. W. Richards, Pastor of the First Evangelical Lutheran Church, Reading, Pa.

(Continued from p. 134, Vol. II.)

SATURDAY AFTERNOON, Nov. 19th, we were visited by Esquire Treutler, and had a long conference till night about the,

Ebenezer matters. This man, together with others, was selected a vestryman or deacon ten years ago, during the life and government of that faithful servant of Christ, pastor Bolzius. At that time, and for some years afterwards, the deacons and elders were sworn into their offices as church wardens and vestrymen by the Judge or Justice of the Peace of the place, according to the manner of the High Church.¹ Consequently the way for the established Church was prepared already at that time with the good intention of receiving protection, certainly not *ex errore voluntatis, sed judicii*.

So it goes with us poor forsaken worms. Our Reverend Fathers &c. are far away: here we find few or none who are adequate counsellors, who are radically acquainted with the case, and favor our side: we are therefore left to ourselves to act according to reason and revelation: we pray and beseech God importunately, but neither oral answer nor inspiration is given—the Established church, viewed on the bright side, appears plausible, and temptations are held forth in addition thereto—and what is the consequence? Too late, advice and censure, *post festum*; when the cloth for the garment has been cut, and will make neither a coat nor a waistcoat. Such sworn vestrymen oftentimes acted too arbitrarily and caused that dear, old, worn out and faithful servant pastor Bolzius, (and Lemke too) much sorrow and trouble, and after their death they disregarded pastor Rabenhorst, did not consult him when the vestry was called upon to act, and thus it occurred, that without the knowledge of pastor Rabenhorst, his name was put into the Grant as co-trustee, in which the land for the Jerusalem's church &c. was placed under the jurisdiction of the Established church, also without his knowledge. And when pastor Triebner came afterwards, and strove in his enthusiasm to trample upon the burden-and-cross-bearer, or to make him unworthy of his office, by representing him, without any cause, to the ignorant people as guilty of theft, fraud, &c. then the bottom was knocked entirely out of the barrel, and edification, blessing and peace were split. I passed a very uneasy and wearisome night.

Nov. 20th, Sunday 25th post Trinit. It froze a finger thick ice last night, and in the morning it snowed a little, which was followed by cold rain and rough north wind. Pastor Rabenhorst and wife drove five miles to Ebenezer village, and I was conveyed five miles to his collegiate church in Goshen, where

¹ See the fourth part of the printed "*Nachrichten*," page 8, at the bottom. MÜHLEBERG.

the neighboring German Evangelical Lutheran families have built a neat wooden house of God, which cost about £30 sterling, to defray the expense of which they collected partly from the English, and contributed partly from their own means, and have nearly paid them, besides having a school house and a pious schoolmaster.—and being faithfully served by pastor Rabenhorst. I preached in the church from the last clause of to-day's pericope: "For whosoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together," showing I. that every one is born flesh of flesh. II. How a nation, family or individual becomes a carcass, if it condemn, reject or abuse reason and the divine revelation of the plan of salvation, and be not anointed from on high. III. The judgments which will follow thereupon, spiritual and bodily, temporal and eternal. a) John 3: 6. Rom. 3: 10-18. Gen. 6: 3, 5. 1 Cor. 2: 14. Eph. 4: 18, 19. b) Rom. 1: 21-32. Ep. Jud. 10. 2 Pet. 2: 10, 12. 2 Cor. 2: 16. Heb. 6: 4-8. c) Isa. 1: 7-9; 6: 9-13. Acts 28: 26 seq. Matt. 23: 37, 38. Luc. 19: 41, 42 seq. After sermon I catechised the youth, who answered readily, because they had been well nurtured by a shepherd who loves Jesus. I was then taken by a spiritually minded deacon to his house, whither the schoolmaster came also, and we were both satisfied with temporal food, and entertained each other with useful conversation. Toward evening I returned home to my family again at pastor Rabenhorst's, who had also just returned from his day's labor, and in the evening refreshed us with some examples from S. T. Gerber's history of the converted.

Nov. 21. To-day we were all somewhat indisposed through yesterday's rough, cold, and wet weather. My wife was again afflicted with sickness after a considerable time of exemption. I wrote.

Nov. 22. In accordance with my request and previous invitation, a meeting was held to-day in the former dwelling of Rev. pastor Bolzius, dec'd. There were present: 1. Rev. pastor Rabenhorst as Trustee; 2. pastor Triebner, also as Trustee; 3. Messrs. John Caspar Wertsch; 4. John Flörl, Jun.; 5. Joseph Schubdrein; 6. David Steiner; 7. Conrad Rahn; 8. Christian Krämer. After a short prayer, Rev. Triebner, at my request, read to the meeting the credentials I had received from our Reverend Fathers and brought with me, and it was then asked whether they approved of them? to which an affirmative answer was given. Mühlenberg, demanded, according to his instructions, an exact knowledge of the Mill Institutions. To this purpose he read to the meeting a copy of the Power of Attorney of Rev. Bolzius, dec'd, in reference to

the mill establishment, April 15, 1757, and pastor Rabenhorst compared with it the original—(see copy in this Journal under Nov. 15th, a. c.) and testified that Mr. Boltzius was best able to give, and had given in this document, the most correct account of the matter, and that he had appointed thereby pastor Lemke the sole director or overseer of the mill establishment, and that said Lemke, dec'd, had assigned the same power of Attorney to pastor Rabenhorst, and that after Mr. Lemke's death it had been delivered to him by Messrs. John Wertsch and John Flörl, Sen., in the presence of David Steiner, Ruprecht Zimmerebener and Christopher Rottenberger, as was just, because Mr. Lemke's own words required it, as follows: "This power of Attorney is to be delivered, after my death, to my worthy colleague Mr. Christian Rabenhorst, even as I received it from Mr. Boltzius. H. Henry Lemke, Ebenezer, April 30, 1767."

NOTE I. This having been read, and it appearing that pastor Rabenhorst did not constitute himself arbitrarily the director or overseer of the mill establishment, but was forced thereto; then the grants of the mill lands were taken from the drawer of the Trustees and examined. 1st, a grant, or patent, or royal cession for 125 acres of land to the late John Lewis Mayer, John Flörl and Theobald Kiefer, their heirs and assigns, in trust for the congregation in Ebenezer; the grant is dated Dec. 9th, 1756, recorded in the office at Savannah Jan. 12th, 1757, in Book A. page 268—in the Auditor's office a memorial hereof in Book A. page 93.

2d. The second grant for mill lands contains 500 acres in Ebenezer District, dated August 7th, 1759, recorded in the office Sept. 20th, 1759, in Book B. page 149; in Auditor's office Book A. page 113. Trustees: Messrs. Christian Rabenhorst, clerk, John Flörl and Lewis Mayer, their heirs and assigns, recorded in the office as aforesaid.

3d. The third grant for mill lands contains 300 acres, is recorded Sept. 20th, 1759, in Auditor's office A. page 113, to the same Trustees as the second, viz. Rabenhorst, Flörl, and Mayer. Consequently the whole mill land contains 925 acres.

4th. But the saw mill, bordering on vacant lands not yet patented, therefore pastor Boltzius took possession for himself of another hundred acres on the side of the other, and built a small house on it, and gave a written declaration dated May 1, 1756, in which he specifies, that said hundred acres shall not pass into the hands of strangers to the injury of the mills, and that the saw-miller for the time being and his successors shall dwell therein. And in case these hundred should be sold,

then the congregation should have the first right to purchase it. The following year, namely June 7th, 1757, pastor Boltzius took out a grant of said hundred acres for himself and heirs, as recorded in the Register's office July 25, 1757, Book A. p. 415. After the death of pastor Boltzius, the aforesaid hundred acres became the inheritance and property of his surviving daughter, Catharine. She promised the same to her kinsman pastor Triebner, and has had a deed executed for him already.

Hence arose the remarks 1, that if the sawmill stood in part, or half, or entirely on these hundred acres of Miss Boltzius, then according to the aforesaid written declaration of Mr. Boltzius, dec'd, day May 1, 1756, the congregation would have the first right to its purchase, as they would otherwise lose the mill. 2dly. Pastor Triebner declared that he would resign his claim, if the mills &c. were placed upon a certain and secure footing. 3dly, it was resolved that the above instrument of Mr. Boltzius dec'd, dated May 1, 1756, belonged, as a document, to the drawer of the Trustees, and that a copy thereof be given to Miss Catharine Boltzius, to which pastor Triebner promised to attend, said document being in his hands.

5th. Furthermore, it was unanimously resolved, that the Trustees of the whole mill lands and appurtenances should execute a counter deed or assignment to an Ebenezer Evangelical Protestant congregation, belonging to the Augsburg Confession, and therein specify the objects, use and benefit, according to the will and design of Rev. Boltzius, dec'd, and our Reverend Fathers, as expressed in the document of April 15, 1759, so that the estate might not, like the Jerusalem church, pass under the jurisdiction of strangers.

6th. The grant, on which the church and schoolhouse in Bethania are erected, was taken into consideration. It contains one hundred acres of land, is dated Dec. 3, 1760, recorded in the office Feb. 1, 1761 in Book B. page 518, in Auditor's office Book A. fol. 219. The Trustees are Hermann Henry Lemke, John Caspar Wertsch and John Michael. The object is defined to be: "in St. Matthew's Parish, for the use of a church and schoolhouse, and for the support and maintenance of the minister and master thereof." *This is unwittingly cut out for the church of England, as there is only one church, stricte sic dicta, *established* in the British dominions.

7th. The grant for 300 acres of land in Goshen was not considered. A small church formerly stood thereon, which is now in ruins, and a new one has been built but on other land. The grant for the 300 acres is to Rev. Boltzius, dec'd, in trust, and

is defined, "in trust for a glebe in St. Matthew's parish, for the use of the ministers of the Lutheran church in Ebenezer," dated Dec. 3, 1760. There is no declaration of trust or assignment for those holding to the Augsburg Confession contained in it. And the termini technici, viz.: *Glebe, Parish, Luth. church*, point to the jurisdiction of the Church of England.

8th. The grant for the Jerusalem's church, as the principal or mother church, in the village of Ebenezer is so strongly arranged and secured, that no help is left for it. Mr. John Wertsch managed the matter entirely alone and suffered himself to be outwitted. He regrets it, but that does not alter the case. See the extracts from the grant, in my Journal Nov. 5, a. c. "vor-gehan und nach gedacht, hat Manchen in gross Leid gebracht."

NOTE II. Before we investigated the grants for the mill and church lands, I read the circumstances regarding the third minister's plantation in its connection in my Journal of Nov. 4th, a. c. distinctly and found no objections to its correctness.

9th. We examined how much of the collections from our Reverend Fathers was applied by pastor Triebner to the building of the Jerusalem church, which, according to receipts in the hands of Mr. Triebner, amount to £238 sterling; and pastor Rabenhorst gave towards the same building £37 sterling out of the mill treasury.

10th. I requested a brief statement of all property yet remaining for an Evangelical Lutheran or Protestant congregation according to the Augsburg Confession.

ANSWER.

- | | Sterling. |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. In the hands of Pastor Rabenhorst a capital of | £649 16 sh. 5d. |
| 2. In the hands of John Caspar Wertsch for the trading store, | 300 00 00 |
| 3. In the Mill Treasury—notes and money, | 229 16 02 |
| 4. Parson Triebner has some money in hands, the application of which has not yet been designated by our Reverend Fathers. | |
| 5. Belonging also to the Estate is a negro boy at Mr. John Flörl's, and a negro girl at Mr. David Steiner's. | |
| 6. A town and an outlot, of which Mr. John Triebner has the grant in his hands. | |
| 7. An inventory of personal goods in the mills belonging to the estate. | |
| 8. And finally, real estate, with the mills, 925 acres of land. | |

That in said meeting, held at Ebenezer Nov. 22, 1784, I found all the above to be thus and not otherwise is testified by me,

HENRY MUHLENBERG, SEN."

In the afternoon, at 3 o'clock, the meeting adjourned, and, after pastor Rabenhorst and I had eaten at pastor Triebner's, we rode five miles to our home.

Nov. 23. To-day I expected severe and heart-rending labor, and found myself troubled and entirely unfitted for the work, viz.: the old and new vestry, witnesses &c. of both the contending parties, together with both the ministers are to meet, in order to attempt a reunion. I prayed secretly to God, but could obtain no confidence, and felt like a poor sinner who is being led forth to execution. Pastor Rabenhorst took me with him to pastor Triebner, and thence we went together to the former dwelling of the late Rev. Boltzius, where gradually were assembled: 1st, Pastor Rabenhorst and of his so-called party, the lately elected vestry, Messrs. J. A. Treutlen, Esq., Ulrich Neidlinger, Joseph Schubdrein, Christian Steiner, Samuel Krauss, John Kugel, Jacob Waldhauer, Esq.; 2d, Messrs. John Caspar Wertsch, John Flörl, Christopher Krämer, Matthew Biddenbach, John Paulus, Paul Müller and Rev. Triebner of the other party; 3d, Conrad Rahn and others as members of the congregation and witnesses. After prayer I mentioned why the Reverend Fathers had sent me hither, and I in obedience thereto had undertaken this wearisome journey, and enquired whether the meeting desired to hear my credentials again? They answered no; they were already sufficiently acquainted therewith, &c.

1st. Mr. Wertsch handed me the charges of his party against the other. Mr. Treutlen protested against their consideration, because his party had not first received a copy thereof, and therefore had no opportunity to prepare a defence. But they having handed their charges against Rev. Triebner in writing to me, and I having given a copy thereof to Mr. Triebner and his party, and they having had time to prepare their defence, it was right and just to examine now their charges against Mr. Triebner.

2d. Messrs. Triebner and John Wertsch were the speakers for their party, and Esquire Treutlen conducted the cause of the larger party.

*I had previously advised my brother Triebner, both orally and in writing, how with a few words he might end the complicated and perplexing strife, viz.: if he would say before the

meeting, "I have erred and ask your cordial forgiveness, and wherein you have wronged me, that I will forgive with all my heart and forget." For under all the circumstances I could impartially learn that in many things he had acted unreasonably, not according to grace but according to our depraved nature. But he thought that he had at all times exercised himself to have a conscience void of offence towards God and man, and would weaken the authority of his office if he asked forgiveness. He would pardon but not ask to be pardoned. I know not whether the Prophets and Apostles of our Lord injured their office, when they acknowledged that faults occurred in their "walk and conversation."

3d. The question was now put whether the charges against Mr. Triebner should be investigated. Messrs. Triebner and Wertsch objected, that they did not recognize the accusers as lawfully elected vestrymen. Esquire Treutlen contended, that they had been elected vestrymen publicly, and by a majority of the votes of the members of the congregation; also offered in evidence two sworn affidavits to prove their lawful election. This matter occasioned a warm debate pro and contra. I wished that Mr. Triebner had refrained from personalities against Esquire Treutlen and the other new vestrymen, and had not exposed the dignity of his office. Using declamations, citations before the Judgment seat of God, and unproved accusations, it was only pouring oil upon the fire. The echo answers to its voice.

4th. I enquired whether a compromise could not be made; for example, if a part of the old vestrymen belonging to Mr. Triebner were added to the new ones? This, however, was not approved, and Messrs. Triebner and Wertsch proposed an entirely new election to be held by the whole congregation. I asked Esquire Treutlen and the other new vestrymen, whether they would agree to it. They answered, no; they were lawfully elected. Then again much warmth manifested itself pro and contra, so that I was afraid.

5th. After a while I said, that the reunion must begin somewhere, and my advice was that the new vestrymen should continue to conduct their office, inasmuch as the time of the old ones was ended. Parson Triebner opposed it and said, that he could not conscientiously perform the duties of his office, if Mr. Treutlen and the other so called new vestrymen remained in office. He would rather keep his little flock to himself, &c. Pastor Rabenhorst remained silent and let his so called party speak for itself.

6th. Finally, Esquire Treutlen, in the name of the other vestrymen, read the charges against parson Triebner, which were investigated under the following heads: 1. Ingratitude; 2d. avarice or greediness; 3d. anger and revenge; 4th. pride and presumption; 5th. hatred, envy and implacableness. Parson Triebner declaimed awhile, and demanded proof and instances of the first charge. The first instance was taken from his conduct towards his colleague Rabenhorst. Mr. Triebner was very fluent in his explanation and justification, and pastor Rabenhorst came to his aid, and stated that their personal misunderstanding had been adjusted already on the 11th of Nov. in this house.

2ndly. He endeavored as much as possible to defend himself also against the charge of avarice, and his party testified very earnestly in his behalf. In regard to the remaining counts, various instances were adduced and testimony given. He endeavored, however, partly to deny, and partly to justify, and to turn it to the best advantage for himself, and began to weep and said, to-day was the day of his visitation, he must suffer and leave it all to the Righteous Judge. I aided as much as I could with a good conscience, and said, that in strife and enmity faults and errors of hastiness were converted into crimes, but where love reigned, they were covered up or endured, &c. But as he thought he had not erred; on the contrary had acted according to grace, conscience and the instructions of our Rev. Fathers; I therefore adduced certain points wherein he had erred, and said, that even a subject of grace carried within him the root or seed of all the aforesaid vices, and, if he watched not, could soon be overtaken by them, and that we must avoid also the appearance thereof. He wept again, and said, such vices as those mentioned were mortal sins, and, if they could be proved against him, he would be unworthy of his office, much less could he continue a minister if the new irregularly elected vestrymen remained—he would rather remain by himself with his little flock. I told them, finally, that obedience and love had induced me to undertake this fatiguing journey to visit them, that with the help of God peace and unity might be restored, &c. But if they were determined to continue in discord and be ruined, then my visit and experiment were ended, and to-morrow, with a sad and heavy heart, I would depart and report the result. At the meeting of yesterday I had hoped, by remaining over winter, that all things might yet be restored to order; but if this were the way it was useless for me to stay, &c. Mr. Wertsch and others said, I should not adjourn yet, but try another proposition. I replied

that the following was my advice: 1) that they should bury all their former contentions and offences and cordially forgive each other, as there were faults on all sides; 2) To open the Jerusalem church for parson Triebner, so that both ministers unitedly might perform their ministerial duties in the congregation; 3) and I would endeavor, with the aid of the ministers, &c. to prepare a plan for the better conduct of the whole matter. Pastor Rabenhorst came to the rescue and supported the proposition with a warm exhortation. I gave my hand to each one present and said, if in ought I had offended or wounded them, they should forgive me. Pastor Rabenhorst did likewise, and parson Triebner followed and said, he would forgive his enemies and would implore God to forgive them also—and thus we separated this time. Pastor Rabenhorst and I ate at Mr. Triebner's, and at evening returned home. I was so tortured and wearied in spirit and body, that I had to lie down. Oh Lord! how much has not the enemy of man already won, if he can effect a breach between ministers and colleagues in a church! What hateful mischief he does to the sheep, when he has disarmed the shepherds! How despised is the holy office and its dignity in the sight of the Chamites and Canaanites when they have seen the nakedness of the fathers and scoff at it!

Nov. 24th. I feel feverish and indisposed. I read to-day in the fourth part of the Ebenezer narrative, in a letter from Rev. Boltzcius, dec'd, to his honor Senior Ulsperger, dated Dec. 21, 1763, on page 5, as follows: "I have sent to you in my packet the obligation of my colleague, Rabenhorst, for the minister's plantation — which I trust will be satisfactory to you and our worthy benefactors — that through your kind contributions he has so well arranged it — and that the capital is *perfectly secured, thank God!*" Further on page 7, "That the fund for the support of Mr. Rabenhorst, (collected through so much kindness and labor), is in *perfect safety* — Since the *purchase* of this plantation it is quite manifest, that there is a great difference between the owner and administrator of such public institutions, &c."

From the above it appears, as I remarked, that Mr. Rabenhorst did not acquire the minister's plantation through fraud and evil practices, as parson Triebner (in writing) and the evil disposed people complained, &c.; that the late Rev. Boltzcius rejoiced at the sale, and that Rev. Rabenhorst took it, with consent of the Reverend Fathers, in a regular manner for £649 16 sh. 5 d. and gave his obligation for it, and the fund was thereby secured.

Nov. 25. The pressure and stricture in my lungs increase, but I can still write or scrawl a little, and therefore begin to spell (subject to correction) an order or constitution, if the cunning enemy draws no stroke through it, and the proverb be not fulfilled: quot capita, tot sensus. My proposition, subject to correction, would be as follows:

CHAPTER I.

§ 1.

In the document of pastor Boltzius, dated April 15, 1757, the intention of the mill institutions is set forth thus: 1) They shall be preserved, secured and improved; 2) the revenues shall be applied to preserve churches, schools, minister and schoolmaster's dwellings, with coöperation of the members of the congregation; 3) also ministers and schoolmasters shall be better supported therefrom; 4) also widows, orphans, sick and superannuated persons in the congregation shall receive aid from it.

§ 2. (Original Document.)

According to this Institution, the Trustees of the mill lands and appurtenances must give a power of Attorney, assignment or the like to the congregational council of the Evangelical Lutheran congregation in and about Ebenezer, acknowledging and holding to the Augsburg Confession and its Liturgy.

§ 3.

The congregational council of our aforesaid Protestant congregation consists, a) of the at present yet living worthy founders, benefactors and directors of these Ebenezer congregations, namely his reverence Frederick Nich. Ziegenhagen (his Britanic Majesty's first Court chaplain); and Rev. John Augustus Urlsperger, Senior of the Evangelical Ministerium of Augsburg; and the successors chosen to succeed them as the most deserving members of the very laudable Society for the Promotion of Christian knowledge in England, &c.—b) further, of the Elders for the time being and of the regularly called minister and pastor longest in office, as President of the Council in loco; and c) of the deacons and their successors, publicly elected by a majority of the regular members of the congregation and inducted into office.

§ 4.

Consequently the direction and superintendence of the mill establishment rests on the aforesaid Church council, as the representatives of the Evangelical Protestant congregations in

and about Ebenezer, acknowledging and holding to the Augsburg Confession and its Liturgy, and the Church council must take care that the revenues of the mills are applied to no other object and purpose than those designated and appointed by the Rev. founders and benefactors in Europe and by the first minister of these congregation, the late Rev. Boltzcius in the document of April 15, 1756; namely according to § 1., 1) that the mill establishment be preserved, secured and improved; 2d) that the revenues thereof be applied to preserve churches, schools, ministers, and schoolmasters' dwelling, with coöperation of the members of the congregation; 3d, that ministers and schoolmasters receive a better support; 4th, that widows, orphans, sick and superannuated poor persons, in the aforesaid congregation connected with the Augsburg Confession, obtain assistance therefrom.

§ 5.

And the Church council, consisting of the oldest minister as President, and of the regularly elected deacons for the time being in loco, or of this place, having, it is true, the direction of the mill establishment according to the designated object, but being unable to bear the burden alone, on account of other extensive business; therefore said vestry shall appoint and empower one or more resident members, (well acquainted with economy and accounts, and who are worthy members belonging to our Evangelical Lutheran congregation holding to the Augsburg Confession), by a majority of votes to be deputy overseers and managers, who shall superintend the mill establishment and appurtenances according to their best knowledge and conscience, keep a just account of debts and credits, and annually render an account thereof to the vestry, so that the vestry may be able to lay before the whole congregation, in congregational meeting, the aforesaid account, and thus afford every one an opportunity to see and hear the state of affairs in the congregation.

§ 6.

As regards the renting of the mills, or the building and improvement thereof, as likewise the application of the revenues, according to the foundation, object and designation as above specified in § 1. and 4.: this is to be always transacted in the meeting of the vestry and the deputy overseers or managers. It shall be maturely considered; be decided by the majority of votes, of at least the President and two-thirds of the vestrymen and deputy overseers and managers; be recorded; be copied by the President of the vestry and transmitted to our Rev. Fathers and benefactors, that the same may likewise know

how the congregation here manages the benefits of their kind contributions—seeing that our benefactors and affectionate brethren in the faith had no other object in view from first to last, and still have no other view, but that in this American wilderness, through approved teachers, and wholesome doctrine according to the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, agreeably to our unaltered Augsburg Confession, &c. a Christian congregation might be founded on the right rock, be established and cultivated, might manifest itself in a Christian walk, and be continued to children's children. The nearer it approaches this object the more comforting and satisfactory it must be for our Rev. Fathers and benefactors to know it—the further from the blessed object the more mournful and unjustifiable.

§ 7.

The amount of money lent or appropriated by Rev. Fathers, as Directors and benefactors in London, Augsburg and Halle, as a fund for the salary of the third minister of the Evangelical Protestant congregation, according to the Augsburg Confession, in Georgia and especially in and about Ebenezer, is £649, 16 sh. 5 d. sterling. It is safe to the present date in the hands of Rev. pastor Christian Rabenhorst, at 5 and 6 per cent. interest, for which capital he has given his obligation to the Reverend Fathers in London and Augsburg as security, because the Ebenezer congregation contributed nothing to the aforesaid capital or fund, although it has the benefit thereof, its interest being applied to the support of a minister. Consequently for greater security a copy of the obligation of pastor Rabenhorst, in regard to the fund, can be preserved by the vestry.

§ 8.

The sum of £300 sterling on interest in the hands of Mr. John Caspar Wertsch and derived from the store, and funded for the benefit of the Evangelical Protestant congregation, according to the Augsburg Confession, in and about Ebenezer, is to be secured by obligation to the worthy congregational council of the Protestant Augsburg congregation in and about Ebenezer, to be applied for the benefit of said congregation.

§ 9.

The following shall be the manner of electing the deacons, as a branch of the Ebenezer vestry; a) Some day before the election the vestry meets, examines the list of names of members who have subscribed this Constitution, and selects impartially, according to their best judgment and conscience, a cer-

tain number of sensible, pious and resident persons; namely three for one, writes down their names and proposes them to the congregation on the day of election, i. e. if eight deacons are to be elected the vestry proposes or nominates twenty-four persons, and the congregation elects by a majority of votes out of that number eight new deacons, who at the next succeeding divine worship on the Lord's day shall be presented in Ebenezer to the congregation by the oldest minister, who shall remind them of the duties of their office (according to the Original in the Introduction to the fourth part of the printed narrative of Ebenezer) and recognize them by giving them his hand, and shall record the whole in the Congregational book. Vide the Duties Num. 1 to 9. 4 deacons during life; 4 deacons elected annually—for Zion 2; for Bethany 2; for Jerusalem church 4. Two remaining; two alternating.

§ 10.

The meetings of the Vestry or Consistorium shall be held as follows: a) when necessary and important matters require a meeting, the President of the vestry shall be notified thereof, and it shall be published in church, the place, day and hour being stated; b) In the meeting itself no disposition of any weighty matter can be accounted binding if all the members of the vestry, or at least the President and two-thirds of the members be not present, maturely consider the subject and consent to it; c) The President opens with prayer and notes the business to be transacted; each matter is examined successively, and having been maturely considered and each member in town having expressed his opinion and given his advice, it is decided either unanimously or by a majority of votes, the decision is recorded, and the record is published to the congregation if it concern any thing of importance, necessary and useful for the congregation to know, as for example, the erection of churches and schoolhouses, their improvement, the election or discharge of schoolmasters, &c. The business having been transacted the President closes with prayer.

§ 11.

In case the oldest minister, as President, should be absent from home or confined to bed for a time, and thus be unable to attend indispensably necessary meetings of the vestry, he shall empower, in a note with his own signature, his colleague and co-pastor of the congregation to supply his place in the meetings, until he can attend them himself.

§ 12.

Should important matters occur requiring the immediate at-

tention and meeting of the vestry, and the members cannot be notified publicly, then each and every respective member may be informed thereof by an express; should the case admit of no delay.

§ 13.

Should one or the other, be it President or member of the vestry for the time being, deviate from our Evangelical religious doctrine, constitution, order and liturgy according to our here introduced Augsburg Confession, and connect himself with another church and congregation, or become a gross offence to the congregation, and the same can be sufficiently proved, then he or they (the degrees of exhortation having been exercised in vain by the vestry,) shall be expelled from the vestry, and shall have no vote in any matter pertaining to the Ebenezer congregation.

ARTICLE VII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Religious Progress; Discourses on the development of the Christian character, by William R. Williams. Boston: Gould, Kendall and Lincoln. 1850.

WE have for some time known *Dr. Williams*, by report, as one of the most learned and eloquent ministers in connection with our Baptist brethren in the U. States. The work before us amply sustains his reputation, and places him, at least as a writer, if not as a pulpit orator, in the ranks of such men as *Melville* and *Channing*, if not of *Robt. Hall* and *Chalmers*. The nine discourses which form this volume, based upon that magnificent sketch of Christian principles contained in 2 Peter 1: 5-7, are not only deserving of the devout study of all classes of christians, whom they are admirably calculated to edify, but may serve as models to the student of theology and the minister of the Gospel whilst aiming at the greatest usefulness and eminence in their "high and holy calling." We here meet with much sound thought, expressed in most fitting words, and beautifully and impressively developing the doctrines of Holy Writ to which they direct attention. We should like very much to give a few extracts, but fear that our limits will scarcely admit of anything of the kind. But the first lecture upon "*Religion as a principle of growth*" (on the words "*Add to your faith*"), so clearly expresses some ideas that we have for some time entertained upon this and kindred subjects, that we cannot forbear from endeavoring to bring together from it a few striking

passages, which at the same time give a fair idea of our author's style. He commences by observing :

"Our age is writing *"PROGRESS"* on its banners, and sends along the benches of its schools, and the ranks of its combatants, as the watchword of the times : *"Onwards."* It bids us forget the things that are behind as incomplete and unsatisfactory, and to press forward to those that are yet before us. We believe that the Gospel, and it alone, adequately and to the full content of the heart, meets this deeply seated craving of our times. Religion is a principle of perpetual progress. *Not that it distends and pieces its old creed by constant innovations* ; or retracts the severity of its early warnings and restrictions ; or makes Fashion its Sinai. Not that it is the docile handmaid of Philosophy, or the contented retainer and serf of worldly rulers, wearing their livery, taking their wages and orders, and acting merely as a higher branch of their police,—a spiritual constabulary force. If it grew thus with the growth of secular systems and governments, it must, on the other hand, share in their decay, and perish in their fall, like a parasite plant blasted by the death of its sturdier supporter." pp. 13-14.

"It is, again, a memorable fact in the present position of Christ's people, that the age is one of *historical research*. The religious controversies of our times seem to transfer themselves into that historic field. The battle with the enemy at the gates soon shifts its scene to the graves of the fathers and the monuments of the old past. * * * As we look on the stalworth, spiritual proportions of these ancient worthies, Christians of our own day seem convicted of comparative degeneracy." pp. 19-20.

"It is an age of eager and rapid discovery in the *Physical Sciences*. * * * And is it thus that Philosophy reforms upon the Bible? No—in the endeavor to outgrow Revelation, it has succeeded in outgrowing reason and brutifying humanity. No—let science perfect yet more her telescopes, and make taller her observatories, and deeper her mines, and more searching her crucibles ; all will not undermine Jehovah's throne, or sweep out of the moral heavens the great starlike truths of Revelation, and least of all the Sun of Righteousness. God's omniscience is never to be ultimately brought down to, and schooled by man's nescience, as its last standard and test." pp. 21-23.

We have room for nothing more than barely to add, that some very good criticisms of several points in the text, and interesting elucidations of one or two topics incidentally introduced, may be found in the Appendix at the close of the book.

CHAMBERS' EDUCATIONAL COURSE : *I. Elements of Zoology, or, Natural History of Animals ; II. Elements of Physiology. In two parts. (I) Vegetable, (II) Animal Physiology. By Dr. G. Hamilton. III. Reid and Bain's Chemistry and Electricity.* New York : A. S. Barnes & Co. 1849.

We have had these volumes of "Chambers' Educational Course," on hand for several months, waiting for leisure to examine them. This we have even now done but partially, but so far as we have looked into them we find them written in a clear and concise style, and giving the latest results of the several sciences which they present. That upon Zoology is the fullest, and

meets a want that has long been felt in our schools for general education, namely, a good and cheap manual for the study of all departments of the Animal Kingdom, introducing the youthful student to it, and impelling him to cultivate an acquaintance with it by exciting an interest in it and love for it. Cuvier's great work (the *Regne Animal*) as modified by Professor Grant is the basis of the system here presented, and we are happy to observe the healthy tone of religious feeling which it breathes. We have no doubt, therefore, that by this combination of science and piety the highest interests of education will be promoted, man being elevated by "a nearer acquaintance with the character and attributes of the Creator, whose Almighty power, boundless wisdom and perfect love are displayed in his Works no less clearly than they are set forth in his Word."

New method of learning the German language : embracing both the analytic and synthetic modes of instruction &c. by W. H. WOODBURY. 2nd edition. New York : Mark H. Newman & Co. Cincinnati : W. H. Moore & Co. 1851.

WE have examined this "new method of learning German," with peculiar interest, both on account of the subject matter itself, and from some knowledge that we have incidentally obtained of its author. Mr. Woodbury's name will at once indicate that he is not a German by descent. Though not a genuine "Yankee" he is a native of the U. States, and had, if we are rightly informed, no knowledge of the German language until, as a young man engaged in commercial pursuits, he found occasion to employ it in his business. His interest in the language increasing with his increasing knowledge of it, he seems to have set himself resolutely to its acquirement. In the course of time, circumstances took him from the centre of Ohio to Germany, where, of course, he had ample opportunity to perfect himself in his favorite study. It is needless to say that, under these circumstances, he, ere long, learned to write and speak the lofty language of Germany with great fluency. His book, therefore, may serve as a specimen of what may be done even by one who commences late in life, in the acquisition of a foreign language.

Mr. W. here gives us the results of his own experience as a learner, and we have no doubt that those who follow his advice will have reason to be satisfied. It is no "royal road," no short cut, no "easy method" that he points out and offers. On the contrary, his plan requires great labor, careful study and constant exercise. And this is, undoubtedly, the secret of success in any thing. The book is one of over 500 pages of closely printed matter intended to give both the practice and the theory of the language. The first, or synthetic, part differs from Ollendorff's method merely in giving German instead of English exercises for the practice of the learner in German composition and conversation. But these are intended to serve as models of similar sentences, which the learner is to form for himself out of elements which the book supplies in sufficient abundance. To the patient and determined student, or with the assistance of an efficient teacher, this plan will doubtless, be productive of the most satisfactory results. But for the young, and for those less resolute in self-improvement, we suspect that Ollendorff's method will be found superior. This, however, is merely an opinion and not the re-

sult of actual experiment. The second part is a very good grammar in the ordinary form, but we consider it a defect, that no attempt is made to familiarize the learner with the irregularities in *gender*, that *crux grammaticorum* in all languages that do not strictly follow the natural gender.

In a word, the book is undoubtedly a good one, and will be an addition to the existing facilities for obtaining a practical acquaintance with that noblest of modern languages—the German.

GERMAN BIBLIOGRAPHY.

WE are indebted to Mr. R. Garrigue, bookseller, (at No. 2, Barclay St. N. York) for a copy of the "Allgemeine Bibliographie für Deutschland." This is a weekly publication of 8–16 pp. Svo. published at Leipzig, the centre of the German book-trade, and containing the title, price, and publisher's name of every work that makes its appearance in Germany. It differs from the "Central-Blatt," to which we have before referred, in not pretending to give an idea of the works published, beyond what may be gleaned from their titles. The first part of the second vol. of "*Hengstenberg's Offenbarung des h. Joh.*" has made its appearance, and extends as far as the 15th verse of ch. 20. — *Albert Knapp* has brought out a second edition of his well known collection of hymns (*Liederschatz*). The work has been entirely re-arranged, and we are pleased to find that he has restored the original text of the older hymns generally, as the numerous changes in the first edition, although often improving their poetical and devotional character, destroyed their value as literary productions. The book (in two vols. large Svo.) now contains nearly four thousand choice hymns, and is offered at the low price of \$2 00. — *C. Tischendorff* has brought out an edition of the Septuagint in vols. which (bound) R. Garrigue offers at \$4 50. — *Dr. K. Zimmerman's* edition of "*Luthers Reformatorische Schriften in chronologischer Folge*" u. s. w. in 7 vols. are also offered for sale by the same bookseller at \$5 50. — *Dr. H. E. Bindseil* continues *Bretschneider's* "*Corpus Reformatorum*" by bringing out vol. XVI. of his complete edition of *Melanchthon's* works (*Phil. Melancthonis opera quae supersunt omnia*). — An additional volume of the sermons of the late *Bp. Dräseke* (*Predigten über d. Brief d. Jacobus*) is announced as forthcoming under the superintendence of his son, *T. H. T. Dräseke*. — *Dr. J. H. Kurtz* is republishing, in a separate form, his "*Beiträge zur Symbolik des alttestamentlichen Cultus*," which originally appeared in *Rudelbach u. Guericke's Zeitschrift*. — *Dr. H. Steinthal* has edited the *Koptic Grammar* of the late *Prof. Schwartz*. — The notorious *Bruno Bauer* has brought out, as a second supplement to his "*Criticism of the Gospels*," a "*Kritik der Paulinischen Briefe*." — The 2nd No. of *Dr. H. Berghaus' translation* of "*Catlin's North American Indians*" is announced as having left the press; as also the 5th vol. of a translation of select works of *Dr. Channing* edited by *Schultze* and *Lydon*.

Elements of Latin Pronunciation, for the use of students in language, law, medicine, &c. &c. By S. S. Haldeman, A. M., Prof. of Natural History in the University of Pa. Philadelphia: Lippencott, Grambo & Co. 1851.

THIS little treatise of Prof. Haldeman well deserves the attention, not only of incipient students, but equally of mature scholars. It is, indeed, very common to represent the pronunciation of the Latin, as well as other so-called "dead languages," as not only irretrievably lost, but as in itself of no importance. We do not believe that either of these positions is tenable. In our use of these languages we must pronounce them in some way, and it is certainly desirable that this way should be as nearly true to nature as may be. There is, as all scholars begin daily more and more to feel, a *philosophy of language*, fixed laws in accordance with which both the sound and the sense of this great medium of thought and communication between mind and mind, yea even between God and the human soul, are evolved. Writing was primarily designed to represent to the eye those sounds by which thought was communicated from mind to mind, and it is in the form of spoken and audible words that language receives its highest perfection, and accomplishes the grand object for which it was at first devised. It is, therefore, highly desirable that written language, or words, when reproduced, or read, should be altered in the tone, or sound, that originally belonged to them. Otherwise, one of the constituents of the word is lost, and the perfection of nature is destroyed—one of its elements of beauty is removed, and it is vain to say that it is of no importance. — Just as well might it be said that the green tints of the forest leaves, or the gay plumage of birds, or the perfume of summer flowers might be taken away without any injury to the objects to which they belong. Moreover, as scholars communicate with each other orally as well as in writing, *uniformity* is desirable in their pronunciation of the same terms, as no one can take pleasure in a babel of tongues at a literary convention now, any more than may have been the case at the building of the tower upon the plains of Shinar some three thousand years ago. The same thing is also to be said in reference to the instruction of pupils. Why should not the teacher, if possible, give them a correct pronunciation, and, if that is not attainable, why should not the same pronunciation, approximating as nearly as may be to the true, be every where communicated? But our business now is, more particularly, with Prof. Haldeman's tract.

This is, undoubtedly, one of the most important contributions to this branch of comparative philology that has ever been published by an American scholar. Though very brief in its compass and unpretending in its claims, and restricted to a single branch of the subject, it does much towards laying the foundation of the science of comparative philology upon a safe basis. The first object is, indeed, merely to ascertain the proper, that is, the original pronunciation of the Latin language, but in connection with this, though incidentally, the general nature of spoken and written sounds, and the affinities of languages in this respect, are discussed in a very interesting, suggestive and satisfactory manner. This was almost an inevitable result of the circumstances in which this essay originated. These are stated by Prof. H. as fol-

lows: "In making some inquiries into the phonetic peculiarities of the aboriginal languages of N. America, I found myself at a loss, from the want of an alphabet in which to record my results, those of Europe being more or less corrupt; and finding the statements respecting the Latin alphabet to a certain extent unsatisfactory and contradictory, I resolved to investigate it, with the intention of using it strictly according to its Latin signification, as far as this could be ascertained." p. 4. The relations of Latin pronunciation to the pronunciation of other languages were, therefore, necessarily involved in this inquiry, and this fact makes its appearance upon every page of the work before us.

After some "Preliminary Remarks," and an Introduction setting forth the occasion of the work, the mode in which the investigation has been conducted, some fundamental principles, and the general results at which he has arrived, Prof. H. proceeds to discuss: 1) the Latin alphabet generally, as to the signs which it employs to represent sounds; 2) the vowels; 3) the nasals; 4) the diphthongs (diphthongs?); 5) labial consonants; 6) dentals; 7) palatals; 8) gutturals; and 9) glottal consonants. A number of valuable notes, discussing many of the most interesting topics involved, are also appended. This discussion is presented in a very thorough and satisfactory, though simple and unpretending manner; and every where bears evidence that the author is at home in his subject. We notice, however, an occasional misapprehension of the correct pronunciation of languages with which the author has, perhaps, had no opportunity of familiarizing himself. For instance, the Swedish words *kista* and *kink* are treated as though they were pronounced as they would be in English, whereas it is a peculiarity of the Swedish *k*, before *i* and vowels of the same class, to change into the aspirate *tsh*, thus, *tshis-ta tshink*. This relation of the Swedish *kista* and our English word *chest* or *tshist*, we may observe, en passant, leads us to the inference, that we are to look for their origin, not in the Latin *cista* or Greek *κίστη*, but in the common root of the Indo-European languages.

The statements, (upon pp. 17 and 18), as to the general powers of the Latin vowels, and their length and shortness are remarkably clear, and we believe correct, and deserve to be thoroughly studied by students who would master this subject. For the sake of beginners the matter might be presented in this way: *A* is long when pronounced as in *arm* = *âarm*; short, as in *art*. Reverse this process and say *ârm* or *âart* (*art*) and it will be readily perceived how great is the difference.

The anatomy of the sounds, that is the description of the physical process by which they are formed in the position of the throat, tongue, teeth and lips and the mode in which the breath is impelled over them and modified by them, is also well executed. No mode is so effective in securing a correct pronunciation of a foreign language as for the teacher to describe and show the organic process. A German may thus, without much difficulty, be taught to pronounce both forms of the English *th*, and the English cockney might soon

be shown, though he is so slow to hear the difference between the sounds of *v* and of *w*.

The section on "The Nasal Vowels," is, to us, the most unsatisfactory part of the work, nothing being said as to the circumstances under which the vowels preceding *m* and *n* become nasal. Nor is the section [*242] upon "The guttural nasal N G" quite as full and explicit, as we should like to see it. The anatomy of nasality which is given in § 100, where it is said, that it "is made by pronouncing the letter with the nasal passage open," does not seem to describe the whole process, the throat and central part of the tongue evidently modifying the action or enunciation very materially.

Perhaps the most interesting, and, so far as we are aware, the most original part of the discussion is that upon the letter *v*. Prof. H. agrees with Pennington and some others, that "The Roman *v* was probably our *w*." The arguments adduced in favor of this position are certainly very strong. The fact that in Latin *v* and *w* were anciently represented by the same sign affords a strong presumption in favor of this. No two sounds are more distinct than *v* and *w*, the former being made by bringing the upper teeth down upon the lower lips, and expelling the breath through the opening as soon as the teeth are raised from the lips, whilst the latter depends upon the round opening of the lips, just as the *ôô* (*u*) sound does, the difference being, that the lips are more protruded to form the *w* than for the formation of the *ôô* (*v*). Thus we can easily see how *tenûs* may be contracted into *tenuis*, but would be unable to account for its passing over into such a form as *tensis*. So *silua* may become *silua* but not *silva*. Crassus might well think *cauneas* (*cauneas*) a contraction for "*caue ne eas*," but not for "*caue ne eas*." The analogy of the English too is greatly in favor of the idea that *v* was sounded as *w*. Thus *vallum*=wall; *vado*=wade; *vasto*=waste; *via*=way; *vermis*=worm; *vespa*=wasp; *vinum*=wine; &c. &c. On the other hand, it must be admitted that the German analogy is almost as strong in favor of the *v* sound of the letter in question; the German *w* approximating towards the *v*. Still it may be argued, that the English language has been more influenced by the Latin than the German, and the presumption is fair that it would reproduce it more faithfully.

But we cannot pretend to follow Prof. Haldeman through the whole of his interesting discussion, in this brief notice. We would merely reiterate our satisfaction with the manner in which he has, generally, executed his work, and express the hope, that we may soon see a more elaborate work from him upon the more recondite parts of his subject. His lectures upon the structure of language, before the Smithsonian Institution at Washington, last winter, have been spoken of by the highest authority as no ordinary production. We know that he has for some time been engaged in preparing a work upon the "Organism of speech." To the appearance of this we look forward with interest, not in the least doubting that it will greatly add not only to his present high reputation in another department of Natural History, but that

it will be a valuable contribution to this department of literature (Comparative Philology), which we rejoice to find daily exciting a deeper interest.

London Labor, and the London Poor. By Henry Mayhew. With *Daguerreotype Engravings taken by Beard.* Parts I, II, III, IV. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, No. 82 Cliff St.

It is a common saying, that "one half of the world knows not how the other half lives." Glances we sometimes get into the sad scenes of abject poverty, or the dark purlieus of vice and crime: but, in general, great ignorance prevails in the different classes of human society respecting each other's mode of living, each other's enjoyments and sufferings. The writer of the work, of which the first four parts are before us, has here undertaken to enlighten the reading public respecting the condition, in all its varied aspects, of the poor in the British metropolis. He has arranged the subjects of his inquiries under three prominent classes, with a number of subdivisions: he has been at immense pains to ascertain and thoroughly to authenticate his facts, and he turns his materials to good account. We have, as yet, only the first four parts, which treat of only one section of "the Street-folks," viz.: "the costermongers": the picture he places before us, is truly startling, and worse, no doubt, is to come. The subject presented, is one of deep and sad interest: some of its features are positively appalling. It is to be hoped that the publication will accomplish the writer's design, and be fruitful of good; that it will give definite aims to the efforts of British philanthropists, and awaken throughout the more favored classes of England a lively and active sympathy in behalf of their suffering and neglected poor, and lead to benevolent and permanently operative measures for their relief and improvement. We are much gratified to learn, that the interest which he has awakened is so great, that so large an amount of contributions for the benefit of coster-mongers is pouring in upon him, as to render necessary the employment of a special agent, for the purpose of relieving the needy by means of loans and otherwise. Even in the populous cities of this prosperous land, conditions like those here depicted either extensively prevail, or are, as yet, only in their incipency. Should not this publication arouse inquiry among us also, and impress us with the wisdom and practical importance of the old maxim, that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure?" We look with deep interest for the forthcoming numbers, and commend them to the attention of christian men and women, who obey the divine precept: "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others."

Malleville. A Franconia Story. By the Author of the *Rollo Books.* New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St.

THIS is the first volume of another series of books for young people, by the inexhaustible and indefatigable Jacob Abbott. The order of the present series is as follows: Malleville: Wallace: Mary Erskine: Mary Bell: Beechnut. The philosophy which has guided the author in the preparation of these

volumes, is briefly stated in the first sentence of his preface: "The development of the moral sentiments in the human heart, in early life—and every thing, in fact, which relates to the formation of character,—is determined in a far greater degree by sympathy, and by the influence of example, than by formal precepts and didactic instruction." With this principle, long familiar to all who know about education, in view, Mr. Abbot is here again exhibiting that extraordinary talent for exerting a most salutary moral influence on the hearts and dispositions of his young readers, in a manner exceedingly attractive and entertaining, which rendered his earlier productions in the same direction so extensively popular and useful. His books can be most cordially recommended to all who have children to train in the way in which they should go.

Elements of Analytical Geometry and of the Differential and Integral Calculus. By Elias Loomis, A. M., Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy in the University of the city of New York, Author of "A Treatise on Algebra;" "Elements of Geometry and Conic Sections;" "Elements of Plane and Spherical Trigonometry, with their Applications to Mensuration, Surveying, and Navigation;" "Recent Progress of Astronomy," &c. &c. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1851.

PROFESSOR Loomis is unquestionably one of the ablest mathematicians (using this term its most comprehensive sense) in our country, as is amply certified by his numerous and excellent publications. The present work, like its predecessors, is characterized by great clearness, by a thorough development of fundamental principles, by a rigid adherence to a well-digested method, and presents all that fullness of explication so much desiderated in a treatise on a subject so abstruse. The book has been written "expressly for the mass of college-students of average abilities;" and for such we know not where a more admirable text-book could be found. We commend it to the favorable consideration of all who give instruction in this department of study.

Nile Notes of a Howadji. New York: Harper and Brothers, 82 Cliff St. 1851.

THIS is the somewhat quaint title of a quaint but very delightful book, by a young New Yorker, who recently made the tour of the Nile, and has here recorded his observations, or rather the feelings and thoughts to which they gave rise. The book is entirely sui generis: it is written in a strain and style which, at the first glance, may seem affected, but, upon closer acquaintance, prove to be the genuine utterances of a thoughtful but somewhat eccentric mind, holding pleasant converse with itself upon the manifold novelties of Egyptian scenery and society. Our American Howadji—the Turkish word for traveller,—without making any parade of learning, betrays his extensive reading, his familiarity with Eastern history, and with classic lore; very important of course, to any one travelling in the East. The book has been liken-

ed to a poem: we are impressed by it, as by a great rolling panorama. It is a great and brilliant picture, unrolling slowly its diversified scenery, squalid at one time, and again splendid, before our eyes, each scene, each group, each figure accompanied by the ingenious, acute artistic descriptions, explanations, narrations, anecdotal gossipings, caustic satires, and moralizings of the exhibitor. It is by no means a common book of travels. It is rich in varied pencillings, and in solid, sensible thoughts, often singular in their conception, and somewhat oddly expressed: the whole constitutes a most agreeable, interesting, and instructive volume. Its external garb is very beautiful.

The Life and Times of John Calvin, the great Reformer. Translated from the German of Paul Henry, D. D., Minister and Seminary Inspector in Berlin. By Henry Stebbing, D. D., F. R., Author of "History of the Church and Reformation," in Lardner's Cyclopaedia; "History of the Church of Christ from the Diet of Augsburg"; Lives of the Italian Poets" etc. In two volumes. Vol. I. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, No. 285, Broadway. 1851.

THE copious fulness of this work may be estimated from the fact, that the first volume in large 8vo., now before us, numbers over 500 pp.—The author, an eminent divine of the Reformed church in Germany, has bestowed upon it the unwearying labor of many years. In order to the production of so extensive a biography, great research was requisite; and this has been prosecuted with indefatigable industry and zeal, and a corresponding success. Proceeding from a Calvinistic divine, the work places Calvin before us in a far more favorable light than that by Dyer, which we recently noticed. While there are some points on which we can scarcely be expected to agree with the author, we are anxious to do justice to his general candor and impartiality. Though an ardent admirer of Calvin, he is not blind to his errors and faults; and though he endeavors to account for these and to excuse them, he does not seek to conceal or to justify them. That his estimate of Calvin's greatness and importance should be higher than ours, is only what we naturally expect and cannot censure. It is a most ample, elaborate, and faithful work, as free from bias as we have any right to look for from a devoted disciple: the rich materials are thoroughly digested into a well-ordered, judiciously constructed whole, the entire arrangement being natural and clear, and the narrative flowing and dignified. The work cannot fail to be attractive and deeply interesting to ministers and laymen of all denominations.

The Women of Israel. By Grace Aguilar, author of "Woman's Friendship," "Mother's Recompense," "Vale of Cedars," &c. In two Volumes. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chesnut St. 1851.

THE author of these two volumes is a lady who has already achieved no small degree of literary distinction. It may be as well to state, that she

is herself an Israelite, with heart and soul staunch and true to Moses and the people of the Old Covenant. The reader must not therefore look into her work for any sympathy with Christianity: the design of her somewhat lengthy introduction, and of her long concluding chapter, is most emphatically the glorification of Judaism. Yet she betrays no hostility to Christianity, but labors only to vindicate her faith from reproaches, in her estimation unmerited; and to claim for the Jewish church merits, to which she regards her as exclusively entitled. So far, however, as we have had time to examine, we are not aware that much of this appears in the main body of the work. She begins with our common mother Eve, thereupon proceeds to Sarah, and then takes up the wives of the other patriarchs, and all the Israelitish women in any way distinguished, down to Berenice, drawing, unfolding, and analyzing their characters, expatiating on their good and their evil qualities, relating their lives in ample detail, presenting much historical information, and a great deal of acute, just, and profitable reflection, and holding up her heroines as examples to instruct and stimulate, or to caution and warn. The work is most ably written, and presents a large amount of most interesting reading.

Louisiana; Its Colonial History and Romance. By Charles Gayarre. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1851.

HERE we have a large 8vo. volume of lectures upon one of the most romantic sections of American history, delivered to select audiences in New Orleans, by one of her most accomplished sons. If the early history of every newly discovered country, just beginning to be settled by civilized men in the midst of savages, abounds in romantic incidents, and chivalrous exploits, this is eminently true of the history of Louisiana, which was first settled by the mercurial, enterprising, often recklessly daring French. The author himself very appropriately, prefixes to his lectures the title: "The Poetry, or the Romance of the History of Louisiana." Possessing a keen relish for the poetic or romantic element in history, he has made himself thoroughly familiar with every thing of this description connected with the French colonies in North America, and exhibits much tact and taste in the conduct of his narrative; a lively imagination, governed by a generous and healthy sensibility, chastened by a just regard for the claims of religion, guided by a quick ingenuity, and aided by a ready pen, eminently qualifies him to distinguish himself in this species of composition. We cordially commend to our readers this volume, so replete with the most engaging and interesting details of romantic history, combined with much valuable information respecting the character, condition, superstitions and customs of the Indian nations who inhabited the Southern portion of North America. It cannot fail to be a most popular book.

Rose Douglass: or, The Autobiography of a Minister's Daughter. By S. R. W. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chesnut St. 1851.

THE Preface speaks of this volume as presenting a true narrative, and actual experiences. *If it be a work of fiction, it is only to be regretted that all novels do not resemble it.* It is a pure, sweet, delightful book, thoroughly imbued with sound religious principle, and warm religious feeling, exhibiting genuine Christian life, and can therefore be safely recommended, as fitted to exert a most salutary influence.

Readings for every Day in Lent. Compiled from the Writings of Bishop Jeremy Taylor. By the author of "Amy Herbert," "The Child's first History of Rome," &c. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chesnut St. 1851.

THE title of this book is alone sufficient to recommend it to those who love devotional reading. It presents, for each of the forty-seven days of Lent, an appropriate selection from the writings of that humble and devout man of God, Jeremy Taylor, concluding with a brief prayer having special reference to the subject dwelt upon in the reflections to which it is appended. "The subjects selected have been such as seemed likely to lead from Repentance and Self-examination, to growth in Grace and Christian Perfection." Though specially designed for a particular season, those who are earnestly striving to cultivate and maintain, in their daily walk and conversation, a spirit of true and lively devotion, will find it at all times a welcome companion, a wise counselor, a gentle, but most serious and solemn monitor. We commend it to christians, as a volume well fitted for the exercises of the retired closet.

First Lessons in Composition, in which the Principles of the Art are developed in connection with the Principles of Grammar; embracing full Directions on the subject of Punctuation; with copious Exercises. By G. P. Quackenbos, A.M., Rector of the Henry St. Grammar School. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chesnut St. 1851.

THIS book is designed not only to teach composition, but to serve as a first book in Grammar. The only fault we have to find, is, that it adheres too closely to the erroneous nomenclature which has been so long in use. Thus, e. g. it persists in designating adjectives that denote possession, by the term "pronouns"; and to show that they stand instead of nouns, it illustrates thus: "John respects John's father, John's mother, and John's teacher," placing the possessive case of the noun instead of the adjective *his*. But, the grammarians to the contrary notwithstanding, these words do *not* stand instead of nouns, and are, therefore, *no* pronouns. How would the author illustrate their pronominal character in such examples as these? I respect my father: Thou respectest thy father: is it thus? I respect I's father: Thou respectest thou's

father:—then would they be pronouns representing pronouns. Or is it thus? I, William, respect William's father: Thou, Peter, respectest Peter's father. How can this be, when I is first, and Thou, second person, and William's and Peter's are third person? In short, the whole affair is one of those absurdities in which books on grammar have so long abounded. But in this the work before us is not singular; it only follows in the footsteps of those which have preceded it. Bating these long familiar grammatical oddities, the work admirably supplies a desideratum long felt: being the production of a successful teacher, it is the result of much experience. It certainly renders the study of grammar not only easy, but interesting, to beginners, and teaches them the art of composition by such natural gradations, and judicious methods, as greatly to facilitate its acquisition. Among books intended for beginners it is decidedly superior to any manual of the kind that we have yet seen.

CHRIST IN HADES: A Poem. *By William W. Lord.* Κατέβη τις τὸν ᾄδην. *Symbolum Anthanasianum.*—*He descended into Hell. The Apostles' Creed*—"Mortem suscepisse et vicisse, intrasse inferos et redisse, venisse in jura Tartari, et Tartari jura solvisse, non est fragilitas, sed Proestas."—*Pet. Chrysologus.* New York: D. Appleton & Co. 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chesnut St. 1851

THE greatest misfortune of this poem is, that it provokes comparison with Milton's great epic: another is, that it mingles the names and fabulous characters of the ancient mythology, with the names, characters, and spirit-powers of Scripture. For the first the author is not to blame; for the second he is. But, winking at this as an excusable anomaly, we cannot but concede that the work evinces great power. It exhibits great breadth and strength of conception in its characters and scenes: the plan of the whole is skilfully developed; the grouping is striking and impressive; the imagery appropriately bright or gloomy, as the respective scenes demand: a genuine poetic inspiration, pervaded by a hightoned seriousness of religious thought, and depth of religious feeling, animates the whole. The poem has unquestionably great merit, and will add not a little to the reputation of the already distinguished author.

The Irish Confederates, and the Rebellion of 1798. *By Henry M. Field.* New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1851.

THIS work commences with a brief sketch of Irish History from the earliest times, which, though necessarily very succinct, is exceedingly well written, and to general readers will be quite satisfactory. It exhibits, fairly, fully, and forcibly, the reasons why the Irish hate the English: and that they should hate them, bitterly and intensely, no man who knows what human nature is, and who reads this sketch, will any longer wonder. Surely, no people in the world were ever more wretchedly misgoverned, more atrociously abused, than the Irish have been by the English. The book presents, in several chapters, biographical memoirs, and characteristics, of Curran, Theobald Wolfe Tone,

Lord Edward Fitzgerald, the Emmets, and other distinguished Irish patriots. The narrative of the rise, progress, successes, and reverses, and termination of the Rebellion of 1798, is clear, candid, copious, spirited, and deeply interesting. Altogether, the work with its historical details its personal portraits, memoirs, reminiscences, and anecdotes, its warm sympathy with American history and institutions, its frank and generous recognition of the relations subsisting between our country and Ireland, is one of deep and stirring interest. The author has brought to his task a clear head and, a warm heart, and a ready pen; and his book will, doubtless, attract much attention, and deepen the interest which our people take in the fate of Ireland.

The Works of Horace; with English Notes. For the use of Schools and Colleges. By J. L. Lincoln, Professor of the Latin Language and Literature in Brown University. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chesnut St.

In this edition of Horace, Professor Lincoln gives the text of Orelli, and all the most important various readings. The notes are very full, judicious, scholarly and satisfactory. We should prefer a thoroughly expurgated edition, as no other author needs sifting more than Horace. The mechanical execution is admirable, and altogether, the volume has strong claims to the favorable regard of instructors and students.

Manual of Modern Geography and History. By Wilhelm Pütz, Principal Tutor at the Gymnasium of Duren, Author of "Manual of Ancient Geography and History," &c. Translated from the German by the Rev. R. B. Paul, M. A., Vicar of St. Augustine's, Bristol, and late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. — First American, revised and corrected from the London Edition. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 200 Broadway. Philadelphia, Geo. S. Appleton. 164 Chesnut St. 1851.

"THE present volume completes the series of Pütz's Manuals of Ancient, Mediaeval, and Modern Geography and History." The first two of these volumes we have already very favorably noticed, and, mutatis mutandis, we may speak in terms equally commendatory of the present publication, as an excellent classbook. School-books in this department must, of necessity, always leave a great deal to be supplied, viva voce, by the teacher; and, for a manual containing what is to be committed to memory, the volume before us is just copious enough: "In the American Edition several improvements have been made; the sections relating to America and the United States have been almost entirely re-written, and materially enlarged and improved." We recommend the work to teachers in academies and schools, as, in all respects eminently adapted to the purposes of instruction in this important branch of study.

Nature and Blessedness of Christian Purity. By Rev. R. S. Foster. With an Introduction, by Edmund S. Jones, D. D., one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. New York. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1851.

IN this work, the subject of christian purity is considered entirely from the Methodist Stand-point, and it is scarcely necessary for us to say, that we do not subscribe to the Methodist theory of sinless perfection. Looking away, however, from this point of difference between us and our Methodist brethren, we are quite ready to bear witness that the book is written in an excellent spirit, and displays considerable ability in the discussion and enforcement of great practical truths. It may be read with profit even by those who do not assent to the theory which it so strenuously advocates.

The Young Ladies' Guide to French Composition. By Gustave Chouquet. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 200 Broadway. Philadelphia, G. S. Appleton, 164 Chesnut St. 1851.

THIS work is all in French, with the exception of a few words given in a series of exercises. The first part, a "Traité de Rhétorique Générale," seems to us very excellent, enriched with many apt and striking illustrations. The second part, consisting of a variety of exercises in writing and reading French, is admirably adapted to lead pupils to the acquisition of a ready skill in the use of this elegant language. The method of instruction is new, and likely, we think, to prove very profitable to advanced pupils, under the guidance of a judicious and experienced teacher. The work has strong claims upon the favorable attention of the lovers of French.

The Autobiography and Memorials of Captain Obadiah Congar. For forty Years Mariner and Shipmaster from the Port of New York. By Rev. Henry T. Cheever, Author of "The Island World of the Pacific," and "The Whale and his Captors." New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1851.

THERE is a solemn interest in the history of every human heart, and there is not one among the crowds around us, whose inward experiences, if recorded, would not be rich in instruction, either encouraging, or warning (awfully so, often) in its character. And it is at all times, in every instance, of special interest, to trace "the rise and progress of religion in the soul." Of these truisms the volume before us furnishes an admirable and most engaging illustration. It details the life of a man unknown to fame, but nobly distinguished among those devoted to his vocation for his sterling excellences, the development of his religious life, the firmness of his religious profession, the consistency of his religious practice, the simple dignity of his christian character, and the unwearied usefulness of his unobtrusive career. To those who love to contemplate illustrations of the power of faith, this volume will be a welcome visitor: not only to sea-faring men, but to readers of every

class, this life of Captain Congar, narrated from his own journal, will be highly instructive, and afford, in its earnest pursuit of duty, in its beautiful consistency and its steady progressiveness, a worthy example for imitation. The volume is calculated to do great good, wherever it may be read.

HARPER'S New Monthly Magazine has been brought to the close of the second volume, in other words, of its first year. The success of this publication is perfectly unexampled in the history of periodicals. It is an admirable miscellany, presenting a large amount of instructive and profitable matter of permanent interest and value, and the lighter reading is unexceptionable in its character. May it continue to thrive and flourish!

Dealings with the Inquisition; or, Papal Rome, her Priests, and her Jesuits. With important Disclosures. By the Rev. Giacinto Achilli, D. D., Late Prior and Visitor of the Dominican Order, Head Professor of Theology, and Vicar of the Master of the Sacred Apostolic Palace, etc. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, No. 82 Cliff St. 1851.

THE author of this work has become widely known, through the narrative of his imprisonment &c. in the dungeons of the Inquisition. We have read the whole of the present volume with the deepest interest. It exhibits in full the train of research, reflection, and experience, through which the author was led to the renunciation of Popery, while still a high dignitary in the church of Rome; narrates his intercourse and gives his conversations with other Romish priests, some of whom sympathized and agreed with, while others opposed and persecuted him; it sets forth, in strong light, the abuses and corruptions of the Papal See and church, details a multitude of official experiences, and recounts his dealings with the Inquisition, which is not dead, but only skulks in secret. Although not free from a slight tinge of self-complacency, and of ultra-protestantism, the work is most ably written, and its disclosures, when we consider by whom they are made, are not only highly interesting, but exceedingly important. We regard the publication of this book and the facts which it discloses, as ominous of Rome's approaching fate; as evidence that, however insolent and encroaching it be just now, the papal hierarchy is in a very tottering condition. Dr. Achilli has become an ardent Protestant, and his work deserves the serious attention of Protestant Christians.

A Greek Grammar for the use of High-Schools and Universities, by Philip Buttmann. Revised and enlarged by his Son, Alexander Buttmann. Translated from the eighteenth German Edition, by Edward Robinson. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1851.

ALL that this work requires at our hands is a notice of its existence in an English translation, in our midst. It is well known, that the elder Buttmann was, during his life, at the head of the grammarians of Germany: the son is worthy of his sire, and the translator is justly celebrated as one of the

most eminent scholars of our land. It affords us inexpressible satisfaction that such a translation has been produced and first published in the U. States. It is, of course, not as copious as the "Ausführliche Sprachlehr," the great thesaurus of Greek grammar, from the same author, which would not be adapted to the purposes of instruction. The work before us is an 8vo. volume of over 500 pp. There is nothing in the English language that can be at all compared with it: no genuine admirer, no faithful student of Greek, can consent to be without it.

Harper's New York and Erie Rail-road Guide-Book: containing a Description of the Scenery, Rivers, Towns, Villages, and most important Works on the Road. With one hundred and thirty-six engravings, by Lossing and Barritt; from original Sketches made expressly for this Work by Wm. Macleod. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St.

THIS is a most seasonable publication, following, as it does, close upon the heel of the opening of the great rail-way from New York through to Dunkirk, on lake Erie. The engravings are handsomely executed, presenting the most striking views of the road and its adjacent scenery: the descriptions are clear, full, picturesque and vivid, interspersed with rich details of fact and anecdote: the letter-press is beautiful, and the whole is indispensable to the traveller on this great thoroughfare: we would as soon think of travelling over the New York and Erie rail-road without eyes as without this book.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF MATHEMATICS; Translated from the Cours de Philosophie Positive of Auguste Comte, By W. M. Gillespie, Professor of Civil Engineering, and Adj. Prof. of Mathematics in Union College. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1851.

WE rejoice that an American scholar has undertaken and so ably executed a translation of the above named work, which has been so favorably received and so highly commended by the first scientific men of Europe. It is one of the six volumes of which the whole "Cours de Philosophie Positive" consists; but, devoted to one department, it is complete in itself. We quote the following from the translator's Preface: "Mill, in his 'Logic,' calls the work of M. Comte 'by far the greatest yet produced on the philosophy of the sciences;'" and adds, "of this admirable work, one of the most admirable portions is that in which he may truly be said to have created the Philosophy of the Higher Mathematics." Morell, in his 'Speculative Philosophy of Europe,' says: 'The classification given of the sciences at large, and their regular order of development, is unquestionably a master-piece of scientific thinking, as simple as it is comprehensive.'" After such testimonies, we need only add, that for comprehensiveness of scope, for clearness of statement and exposition, for breadth of inquiry and depth of thought, we esteem it superior to any work in this department of science with which we are acquainted; and we agree with the translator, in regarding its presentation in the present form as a most useful contribution to mathematical progress in this country.

A HISTORY OF GREECE, *From the earliest Times to the Destruction of Corinth*, B. C. 146; mainly based upon that of Connop Thirlwall, D. D., Bishop of St. David's. By Dr. Leonhard Schmitz, F. R. S. E., Rector of the Highschool of Edinburgh, and author of "*A History of Rome from the earliest Times to the Death of Commodus, A. D. 192.*" New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, No. 82 Cliff St. 1851.

DR. SCHMITZ is so well known as a first-rate pedagogue, that any aids which he may furnish for the business of instruction can scarcely require any recommendations from others. He tells us, on the title-page and in the preface, that he has based the work now before us mainly on Bishop Thirlwall's great History of Greece, which is, we believe, universally admitted to present the most complete and life-like "picture of that remarkable nation, the Hellenes." In the present volume the work of abridgment and condensation has been performed with great skill, with just discrimination, with good taste, and with that clear perception of what is adapted to the wants of higher schools and colleges, which betokens the experienced practical teacher. The work is sufficiently copious of detail to render it very acceptable to general readers, whose want of leisure or of means deprives them of the satisfaction of reading more extended histories, whilst, as a class-book for schools and colleges, it is neither more nor less than what is wanted. A 10mo. vol. of over 500 pp., it is far more extended than the pitiful epitomes which have so long been in use, yet by no means more than is needed in a portion of history so interesting and important. Let those who are employed in teaching history examine and judge for themselves.

The Fitness of Holy Scripture for Unfolding the Spiritual Life of Men. II. Christ the Desire of all nations; or the unconscious prophecies of Heathendom: being the Hulsean Lectures for 1845 and 1846: By Richard Chenevix Trench, M. A.; from 2nd London Edition, revised by the author. Philadelphia: H. Hooker, 1850. 12mo. pp. 322.

THE works of Trench are among the most interesting and valuable additions which have been recently made to English Theology. He has been taught in the better school of Germanic thought, and shows, not only on every page but in every sentence, that he has penetrated to a real acquaintance with the views which he embodies. There is great light and force in his writings; and though we find in them little that is positively new, we discover much which must strike the English reader as eminently original.

The Hulsean Lectures are not unworthy of his reputation. The best parts especially of the series for 1845, will probably be regarded as more striking than any thing which has yet come from his pen. It is refreshing to see the old beaten track of English Apologetics deserted, and views presented which have some bearing on the forms of unbelief actually prevailing. The old view of Watson and Paley had fairly been worked out. The sort of infidelity which they attacked, has not only been overthrown but annihilated. New species of infidelity have arisen; and to meet these in part, the Lectures of

Trench have been prepared. Much of his argument is of that interesting kind which results from a concession of all the statements of an adversary, and a demonstration from them that all his principles are false. After an Introductory Lecture he treats of the Unity, the Manifoldness, the Advance, the past Development, the Inexhaustibility, the Fruitfulness, and the Future Development of Scripture. Of these Lectures we were pleased most with the one on the Unity, and least with that on the fruitfulness of Scripture; but there is not one of them which is not rich and deeply interesting.

The style of these lectures is far from being a model of good English, but it has great force — always reveals a clear meaning when closely examined — and is very rich in illustrations. Trench has evidently aimed in his studies at combining a knowledge of the old with that of the new. Every thing he writes bears a powerful impress received from the theology of that "people who not in blood only, but in much besides, are most akin to us (the English) of all the nations of Europe"; and his notes are among the happiest modern illustrations of the felicitous use to which the fathers may be turned.

The train of argument in the second course of Lectures does not possess the interest of the first—not from any defect in handling, but because of the nature of the subject. The argument in the first course was derived from the life of Christianity itself. It was designed to show the "fitness of Holy Scripture for unfolding the spiritual life of men," through all generations. The second proposes to show Christ to be the End or fulfilment of all that was true in the longings of the Gentile world. The same argument, though not precisely in the same form, has been handled by the older Apologists, viz. by Grotius, for instance in his book "*De Veritate*."

After the Introductory Lecture, we have, "The Vanquisher of Hades," "The Son of God," "The Perfect Sacrifice," "The Restorer of Paradise," "The Redeemer from Sin," "The Founder of a Kingdom." The work closes with an admirable Lecture on the moral uses connected with a proper study of Heathen Antiquity.

Though we have said that the second part will not on the whole compare in interest with the first, we do not mean to imply that it is not well worth reading. We do not expect to see any thing from the pen of Trench, of which *that* can of truth be said. The hold which his writings are taking upon those who read, would add a proof if any were needed, that the day has actually come when the Germanic mind is beginning to find capable interpreters in the English language—that its deep, and on all sides masterly, theology is destined to renovate the churches of England and America, and that the hour is at hand when no man will be acknowledged as having the culture necessary for a great teacher of Christianity in this age, who is not thoroughly versed in its language and literature.

Trench is Professor of Divinity in King's College, London. The other works by which he is favorably known are Notes on the Parables, Notes on the Miracles, and "The Star in the East"; and each of them may be said to be on the whole the most valuable work on its subject which has come from an English hand.

FAUST: A Tragedy, by J. W. von Goethe. Translated into English verse by J. Birch, Esq. Embellished with twenty-nine Engravings on steel, after Moritz Retszch. London and Leipzig, 1842. 8vo. pp. xvii. 276. Do. Second Part. 1843. pp. xxxiv. 342, xcvi. Eleven Engravings after Retszch.

THIS work is remarkable for the exquisite beauty of its typography, and the happy transfer of those amazing outlines of Retszch, which give to the English reader a more perfect idea of what Faust is, than any translation whatsoever could. We question whether Goethe himself could see the wonders of his own work perfectly without having seen these outlines.—Hayward's prose translation of Faust embraced only the first part, though he added a fine review of the second. The first attempt at a translation of the second part, after being issued at Dumfries in 1838, appeared from the press of Pickering in 1842. It is metrical, and has not mastered the difficulties of the task — nor will they ever be mastered. We believe that Birch is the only translator of the whole of Faust, though at least seven translations of the first part had preceded his. He goes through his work with a placid jog-trot, sometimes doing pretty well, but on the whole, even when taken with his many co-workers, leaving it a fixed fact that there is an absolute necessity, if you wish to enter into the most remarkable (Heaven forbid we should say the best) poem the world has ever seen, that you should *master* the German language, *Master* it we say, and nothing will more thoroughly test and in some respects reward a mastery than this strange poem — this mingling of blasphemy and simple songs of piety, of low drollery and of the most common-place vulgarities of superstition, with the highest sublimities of poetry, of gross lasciviousness and pointless riddles, with those revelations of human nature and those beautiful and terrible touches of art which call forth all that is tender and fearful in the passions of men. No man is likely to be better or happier for reading Faust. Its author was a heartless voluptuary, and we have yet to read a single work of his which does not leave a stronger impression of his depravity than of his genius.

Hymns selected and original for public and private worship.—Published by the General Synod for the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Sixtieth edition. First revised edition. Hymns 1024. pp. 671. Baltimore: T. Newton Kurtz.

WE hail with sincere pleasure the appearance of the new edition of the Hymn Book, and although, from the well known qualifications of the Chairman of the Committee, Rev. Dr. Reynolds, upon whom the labor principally devolved, and the attention he had given the subject, much was expected; yet we are certain these expectations have been more than realized. We have been much gratified with our examination of the work, and cannot refrain from expressing our admiration of the labors of the committee, which have been brought to so successful an issue. No one, without a careful examination of the volume or an attentive comparison of the changes made, can form an adequate idea of the improvements or the amount of labor expended upon the work. Hymns, altogether deficient in literary merit, or contrary to sound crit-

icism, or correct taste, have been removed; objectionable stanzas have been rejected; ungrammatical phraseology corrected; necessary verbal changes made; known deficiencies supplied; and suitable hymns substituted in the place of those removed. The old book, although we were attached to it and regarded it as an excellent collection, contained numerous blemishes and every unprejudiced mind saw that it was susceptible of improvement. Perhaps we now have one of the best selections of Hymns to be met with in the English language, admirably adapted to the purposes of both public and private worship, and suited to every variety of occasion and circumstance. The volume will surely be rendered more generally acceptable and more extensively useful; and we congratulate the church upon what has been accomplished. We leave the work, with sincere respect for the abilities of the distinguished Editor, with deep gratitude for the service he has rendered, and with the safe prediction, that an acquaintance with the merits of the volume will secure for it the highest and general satisfaction.

A copious and Critical English-Latin Lexicon, founded on the German-Latin Dictionary of Dr. Charles E. Georges. By Rev. J. E. Riddle, A. M., and Rev. T. K. Arnold, A. M. First American edition, carefully revised and containing a copious Dictionary of proper names from the best sources, By Charles Anthon, LL. D. Prof. of Greek and Latin, Columbia College, N. Y. Harper and Brothers: New York. p. 764.

THIS is a most valuable work and supplies a *desideratum* that has long been felt by the classical student. It embodies an amount of matter, accessible in no other book on the same subject in the English language. It is the only English-Latin Dictionary that a student can consult with the reasonable hope of finding what he wants, or the certainty of being able to depend upon that which he does find. It not only gives an account of the use of words and their synonymical distinctions, but enters also into all the niceties connected with their use by classical writers. An examination of the work will convince any one of its excellencies; its preparation must have been an Herculean task; but its merits will undoubtedly secure for it a very general introduction into our classical institutions. The work will prove a most valuable auxiliary to the student in Latin composition, as to the necessity of frequent practice in which for accurate scholarship, all are agreed. We direct attention to the Lexicon as a most important contribution to classical learning and commend it to the consideration of those for whose use the work has been specially prepared.

CLASSICAL SERIES: edited by Drs. Schmitz and Zumpt. *M. Tullii Ciceronis Orationis Selecta XII.* Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard.

WE have already expressed a favorable opinion of this admirable series.—The present volume possesses all the excellencies which distinguish those previously published, and fully sustains the reputation of its editors so eminent as scholars and teachers. While the books are accurately, clearly and beautifully printed, with such illustrations as really tend to elucidate the text

and notes to aid the pupil, where aid is actually required; they are furnished at a price so very low, that they cannot fail to commend themselves to the regard of the public.

GERMAN RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

Zeitschrift für die gesammte Lutherische Theologie und Kirche, herausgegeben von Dr. A. G. Rudelbach zu Copenhagen, und Dr. H. E. F. Guericke zu Halle. 1851, 1st Heft.

1st Article. Contributions to the Symbolik of the Old Testament Worship Joh. Heinr. Kurtz, D. D. and ordin'y Prof. at Dorpat.

2d. Contributions to the Symbolik of the Mosaic Worship, by Dr. William Neumann.

3d. When did Obadiah prophesy? answered by F. Delitzsch.

4th. Theosophy and Church Doctrine, by R. Rocholl, Diaconist at Sachsenberg, Princip. Waldeck.

5th. The parable of the laborers in the Vineyard, by W. F. Besser.

As usual an extensive notice of new publications.

1851. — ZWEITES HEFT.

Article 1st. C. Keil. On the names of God in the Pentateuch.

2. A. G. Rudelbach. State Church and Religious freedom.—5th division.

3. F. Delitzsch. Two sure points in regard to the prophecy of Joel.

4. K. Ströbel. The threatening danger of a Protestant papacy. 1st Article.

5. C. P. Krauth. The Lutheran Church in the United States.

The last is a translation of the first Article in the July number (1850) of the Evangelical Review, and is published with the following note:

"Es wird unseren Lesern mehr als interessant, ja rührend seyn, aus diesem authentischen Original-Documente anschaulich und gründlich zu ersehen, ob, und in wie weit die tonangebendste und umfangreichste nord-amerikanische lutherische Kirche, die der General Synode, dieselbe, welche wir jüngst noch auf dem geraden Wege zum entschiedensten Abfall begriffen sahen, (vgl. Zeitsch. 1846, Hft. 2, S. 125, ff.) neuerdings dem Sauerteige der dortigen streng und reinlutherischen gegenüber heilsam um- und eingelenkt hat."

ERRATA.

Page 65, line 14 from the top, to be accomplished to see ac.

- | | | | | |
|--|----|---------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 67, | 1 | " | without | Without, (put a period after 16.) |
| " | 6 | bottom, | deviated, | read deviates. |
| 68, | 1 | " | insert in between | 'Religions,' and 'the Discours. |
| 69, | 6 | top, | for <i>His</i> , | read <i>This</i> . |
| 72, | 2 | " | for penitential, | read penitent. |
| 73, | 6 | " | for use, | read used. |
| 84, | 20 | bottom, | for regard, | read regards. |
| S5, note, line 2 from bottom, dele <i>and</i> before 'is precisely.' | | | | |